

HARVARD STUDIES
IN
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

*EDITED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE CLASSICAL
INSTRUCTORS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY*

VOLUME XXXV



CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1924

Anno 1778.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY



OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES
LIBRARY



92

HARVARD STUDIES
IN
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

*EDITED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE CLASSICAL
INSTRUCTORS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY*

VOLUME XXXV



CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1924

24731

480

H26

v. 35

PRINTED AT THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U. S. A.

PREFATORY NOTE

THESE Studies are published by authority of Harvard University and are contributed chiefly by its instructors and graduates, although contributions from other sources are not excluded. The publication is partly supported by a fund of about \$7,250, generously subscribed by the class of 1856.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH,	}	EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.
EDWARD KENNARD RAND,		
GEORGE HENRY CHASE,		

CONTENTS

CICERO'S <i>Orator</i> AND HORACE'S <i>Ars Poetica</i>	1
By Mary A. Grant and George Converse Fiske.	
CHACHRYLION AND HIS VASES	75
By Ruth McKnight Elderkin.	
A NEW APPROACH TO THE TEXT OF PLINY'S <i>Letters</i> . II . . .	137
By Edward Kennard Rand.	
SUMMARIES OF DISSERTATIONS FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D., 1923-24	171
INDEX.	175

CICERO'S "ORATOR" AND HORACE'S "ARS POETICA"

By MARY A. GRANT and GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE

THIS study is a collaborative investigation undertaken by Miss Mary A. Grant of the University of Kansas and myself. The *inventio* is essentially hers. The *dispositio* and *elocutio* are mine. I am glad to acknowledge my obligation to Miss Grant for her collation of material, made with scholarly industry and arranged with admirable discrimination. She is not responsible for any errors of omission or commission in the present study.

I may describe this study as a reconnaissance in force, directed toward the immediate problem of the relationship between the *Orator* of Cicero and the *Ars Poetica* of Horace. In the busy days of the war when I was teaching a section of the R. O. T. C., I asked a prospective officer in my 'division' how he would make a reconnaissance. He replied, greatly to the delight of the class: "With my artillery." A reconnaissance with artillery is unknown to military science. Conceivably it would differ little from a general engagement. By analogy I should construct a *stemma* of rhetorical content. Such a *stemma* should include the rhetorical studies of the sophists and Gorgias, the rhetorical dialogues of Plato, the Isocratean rhetorical theories, the Rhetoric and Poetics of Aristotle, including the problem of the *Pan-decteia* and the rhetoric of Anaximenes, an estimate of the influence of Theophrastus, the *τέχναι* of the Hellenistic period, and the influence of Stoic rhetorical theories, as well as those of the later Peripatetics and members of the Academy. On Roman soil the course of the stream of rhetoric must be mapped from the literary and rhetorical activities of Diogenes of Babylon, Panaetius, and the members of the Scipionic circle, through the controversies of Atticism and Asianism to the rhetorical doctrines of the Ciceronian and the Augustan age,¹ to Quintilian and the rhetoric of the empire. One is overwhelmed at the breadth and complexity of the relationships involved. Yet something

¹ In this period the labors of Dionysius of Halicarnassus have hardly received due recognition from American scholars.

like this is the task which Marcus Tullius Cicero attempted for the men of his age.

In the *Orator* 140-148, Cicero, a Roman senator who seeks to harmonize the claims of popular success with those of humane learning, has the high social courage to defend the *ars docendi*, a calling mainly given over to Greeks, freedmen, and slaves. And in fact the *Orator* gives us a popular, but learned approximation to a *τέχνη ῥητορική*. The picturesque tribute of Quintilian 12, proem, 4, is no exaggeration of the sober truth:

nunc caelum undique et undique pontus. unum modo in illa immensa vastitate cernere videmur M. Tullium, qui tamen ipse, quamvis tanta atque ita instructa nave hoc mare ingressus, contrahit vela inhihetque remos et de ipso demum genere, quo sit usus perfectus orator, satis habet dicere.

I hope that this proem has made it clear that it is not the purpose of this paper to point out verbal resemblances between the *Orator* and the *Ars Poetica*. It deals rather with the community of ideas, of commonplaces, if you will, operative within the field of poetical and rhetorical theory covered by the *stemma*, and even here rather with the horizontals and diagonals which indicate the cross relations between the *Orator* and *Ars Poetica* than with the vertical lines which plot the descent of rhetorical, literary, and poetic theory.

The words of Quintilian admirably describe the mediating influence which the rhetorical works of Cicero exercised in transmitting the doctrines of Greco-Roman rhetoric to the Augustan age. Naturally these works powerfully re-enforced the claim of rhetorical studies to the central position in the Roman educational curriculum, but better still they aroused, by their close connection with Cicero's philosophical works, the consciousness of the educated classes to the fact that philosophical studies had much to contribute to the power and the position of the liberally trained orator. The influence of philosophy, even of Ciceronian philosophy, in moulding the Horatian *ars vivendi* needs no formal demonstration. The influence of rhetoric was equally potent, and should require no detailed proof.¹ I shall confine myself to the

¹ Paul Lejay in his masterly edition of Horace's satires has deserved well of all scholars by his detailed, though not exhaustive, examination of the influence of Cicero's philosophical and rhetorical works upon Horace's satires. Compare his introduction and prefaces to the individual satires, *passim*.

citation of a few patent facts in support of this assertion, and shall then turn to a summary statement of the results attained by the most important recent studies of the arrangement and content of the *Ars Poetica*. We shall thus be in a position to take up the question of the interrelations between Cicero and Horace in its true historical perspective.

As a convincing demonstration of how the apparent inconsequence of the Horatian *sermo* may conceal a rather systematic rhetorical schematization I will cite Hendrickson's study of Horace's satire 1, 6, entitled: "The Literary Form of Horace, *Serm.* 1, 6."¹ Again no one can leave the study of the Heinze-Kiessling commentary without a conviction that the *Ars Poetica* of Horace is steeped in Hellenistic rhetoric. Let us not forget also that Horace journeyed from Rome to Anxur, on the famous journey to Brundisium, in the company of the rhetorician Heliodorus.²

Frank's *Virgil*, Chapter V, "A Student of Philosophy at Naples," may serve as a convenient summary of the evidence which connects Virgil, Horace, Caesar, his father-in-law Piso, Manlius Torquatus, the consulars Hirtius and Pansa, and Dolabella, Cassius, the liberator, Trebatius Testa, the jurist, Atticus, Cicero's lifelong friend, and many other figures of the Ciceronian and earlier Augustan age with the Epicurean sect in general, and in particular with the pettifogging Philodemus of Gadara, associated with the great house of the Pisones. Philodemus was known to Cicero,³ and Horace quotes him in *Serm.* 1, 2, 121. Siro, Virgil's Epicurean master, was closely connected with his school. Quintilius Varus, the famous critic of the concluding lines of the *Ars Poetica* (438-452) and of *Carm.* 1, 24, and Varius Rufus are twice mentioned in the Herculanean rolls recovered from the library of Philodemus, and there are fragments which call for names of the length of [πλώτ]ιε and ού[εργίλιε]. Horace also, according to Körte,⁴ was almost certainly a member of the same circle. In any case, he combines⁵ the names of Plotius, Varius, and Virgil as his literary associates. The ode on the death of Quintilius Varus (1, 24) is addressed to Virgil. In any case, it would have been natural for Horace,

¹ *American Journal of Philology*, XXIII (1902), pp. 388-399.

² *Serm.* 1, 5, 2.

³ *In Pisonem* 68.

⁴ *Rheinisches Museum*, XLV (1890), p. 172.

⁵ *Serm.* 1, 5, 40; 1, 10, 44-45 and 81.

when writing his *epistula ad Pisones* [*de Arte Poetica*] to the son and grandsons of Philodemus' patron, to have recourse to the *περὶ ποιημάτων* of Philodemus. Thanks to the untiring industry and acumen of Christian Jensen we now know that Philodemus criticized poetic theories which are closely related to those of Horace's *Ars Poetica*, and some of which are probably to be attributed to Neoptolemus of Parium.¹

And finally let us remember that from the days of the Platonic dialogues and the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* of Aristotle to those of the *περὶ ῥητορικῆς* and the *περὶ ποιημάτων* of Philodemus Rhetoric and Poetics were sister disciplines. That Horace felt them so is abundantly evident from his discussion, *Serm.* 1, 4, 38 ff. and his famous summary of the stylistic qualities of the *sermo* (1, 10, 10 ff.):

et sermone opus est modo tristi, saepe iocoso,
defendente vicem modo rhetoris atque poetae,
interdum urbani, parentis viribus atque
extenuantis eas consulto.

The same consciousness of the intimate relation between rhetoric and poetry frequently crops out in the rhetorical works of Cicero. Witness Cicero's careful study of prose rhythm in its relation to poetic rhythm. I shall quote only one passage,² which is strongly reminiscent of Horace's similar dictum about comedy, just cited from the fourth satire:

itaque video visum esse nonnullis Platonis et Democriti locutionem, etsi absit a versu, tamen, quod incitatius feratur et clarissimis verborum luminibus utatur, potius poema putandum quam comicorum poetarum apud quos, nisi quod versiculi sunt, nihil est aliud cotidiani dissimile sermonis.³

¹ It is outside the scope of this paper to consider whether Jensen has allocated to Neoptolemus lines which can not be definitely assigned to him. In any case, the body of poetic theory criticized by Philodemus is of utmost importance for our fuller knowledge of many of the doctrines of Horace's *Ars Poetica*. In my judgment Jensen has also made it evident by his remarkable article in the *Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1918, *philosophisch-historische Klasse Nr. 14*, "Neoptolemos und Horaz," that there existed in the works of one or more Hellenistic writers argumentative sequences and illustrations similar to those of Horace.

² *Orator* 67.

³ Compare also *Orator* 62, 66, 109, 227; *De Oratore* 1, 70; 128; 3, 27; 174; *Topica* 32. Shelley's opinion as to the poetic quality of Plato, expressed in his

Having thus sought to demonstrate, though not exhaustively, the acquaintance of both Cicero and Horace with the interlacing theories of poetics and of rhetoric, we may now turn to a summary appraisal of the results of recent investigations as to the arrangement, content, and sources of Horace's *Ars Poetica*. I shall speak only of the studies of Norden, Hack, Kroll, Jensen, and Barwick. The common tendency of all these studies is to connect the argumentative sequences and doctrine of the *Ars Poetica* with the rhetorical tradition.

Norden's well known article, *Die Composition und Litteraturgattung der Horazischen Epistula ad Pisones*,¹ proposed the thesis that the *Ars Poetica* was an εἰσαγωγή or introduction to an art, arranging its material under the two main rubrics of *ars* or τέχνη and *artifex* or τεχνίτης. Subsequent investigations have tended to modify the titles and boundaries of a few of Norden's subdivisions within this general scheme, but have confirmed the essential correctness of the scheme itself. Hack, in *The Doctrine of the Literary Forms*,² demonstrated in greater detail the close relationship between the rhetorical theories of Cicero and Horace's *Ars Poetica*. Especially valuable is his evidence for the influence of Plato upon Cicero and Horace, though he underestimates the fact that much of this influence was first filtered through the rhetorical textbooks and lectures. On the other hand, Hack is right in insisting on the fundamental importance for the interpretation of the *Ars Poetica* of the doctrine of Propriety or Decorum. I believe that rhetoric brought this doctrine into closer relation with the Pla-

Defence of Poetry (edition of A. S. Cook, Boston, 9) is worth quoting in this connection. "The distinction between poets and prose writers is a vulgar error. . . . Plato was essentially a poet: the truth and splendor of his imagery and the melody of his language are the most intense that it is possible to conceive. He rejected the harmony of the epic, dramatic, and lyrical forms because he sought to kindle a harmony in thoughts divested of shape and action, and he forbore to invent any regular plan of rhythm which would include under determinate forms the varied pauses of his style."

¹ *Hermes*, XL (1905), pp. 481-525. For a fuller summary, see my *Lucilius and Horace*, pp. 446-449 (*University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 7), Madison, 1920. This will hereafter be cited as *Lucilius and Horace*.

² *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXVII (1916), pp. 1-66. In my *Lucilius and Horace*, pp. 470, 471, note 38, I have stated my entire disagreement with Hack's theory as to the origin, development, and value of the doctrine of the Literary Forms.

tonic theory of Ideas than even Hack has realized. Recently the distinguished German scholar, Wilhelm Kroll, discussed *Die Historische Stellung von Horazens Ars Poetica*.¹ This article has the merit of setting forth in clearer light: (1) the importance of the Platonic contribution to the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* of Aristotle; (2) the importance for the study of the rhetorical and poetical theory of Theophrastus and his Peripatetic successors of the material contained in Kaibel's article: *Die Prolegomena περὶ κωμωδίας*;² (3) the importance of the debate between Epicureans and Stoics as to ethical and phonetic values in the art of poetry, and of the fragments of Philodemus about 60 A.D. from the Epicurean library at Herculaneum; (4) the position of Horace's more immediate source, Neoptolemus of Parium, in relation to these oft-debated problems of rhetoric and poetics; (5) the importance of the doctrine of *πρέπον* or decorum.

But the most valuable contribution to the interpretation of Horace's *Ars Poetica* is found in the article of Christian Jensen already cited.³ Jensen seeks to reconstruct a certain number of the topics contained in the poetic art of Neoptolemus of Parium. Now Porphyrio at the beginning of his commentary on the *Ars Poetica* says: *in quem librum conguessit praecepta Neoptolemi τοῦ Παριανοῦ de arte poetica, non quidem omnia sed eminentissima*. Even if Jensen's reconstruction is in places over bold, it yet seems to afford striking confirmation of the essential soundness of Norden's theory. Thus one of the writers (Neoptolemus ?) criticized by Philodemus also subdivided the rubric *τέχνη* into (1) *ποίησις* or artistic composition which dealt with the ideas, arrangement, and character delineation, and (2) *ποίημα*, which dealt with the problems of *λέξις* (*elocutio*) or artistic expression. To these he added a much shorter category of the function of the poet, *ποιητῆς*, which is concerned with the poet's activity in both fields.⁴

¹ *Sokrates*, LXXII (1918), pp. 81-98.

² *Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellschaft*, N. F. II, 1898. One may now add *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy*, by Lane Cooper, New York, 1922.

³ *Supra*, p. 4, note 1.

⁴ For a detailed application of this scheme to Horace's *Ars Poetica* cf. Jensen *op. cit.*, pp. 18 ff. (see above p. 4). Lucilius must have been familiar with a somewhat similar scheme. See Marx' Lucilius, lines 338-347. I am inclined to believe that this method of distribution has in fact influenced the architectonics of the *Ars Poetica*, but I must reserve judgment as to the extent of that influence pending

Finally Barwick's article, *Die Gliederung der Rhetorischen τέχνη und die Horazische Epistula ad Pisones*,¹ seeks to prove that the *Auctor ad Herennium*, the Ciceronian rhetorical works, the *Ars Poetica* of Horace, and Roman rhetoric in general show traces of the arrangement of rhetorical material according to diverse schematizations, which may be summarily stated as follows: (1) under the rubrics *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, etc.; (2) according to a scheme of distribution under the *partes orationis*; (3) and especially important, according to a rather intricate interweaving of the two schemes of disposition; (4) these various systems of arrangement were adapted to the simpler and more natural distribution of material under the rubrics *ars* and *artifex*.

In connection with what I may call the interwoven scheme of distribution, two points perhaps deserve special mention because of the traces they have left upon the *Ars Poetica* and the rhetorical works of Cicero. The first question, which is simple, may be briefly dismissed. As Shorey has shown,² and as Barwick has illustrated in further detail, the qualities of φύσις (*natura*), μελέτη (*exercitatio*), and ἐπιστήμη (*doctrina*) play an important part in the τέχνη ῥητορική, but rather under the rubric τεχνίτης, where they more properly belong, and where I shall later discuss them in connection with *Ars Poetica* 408-412.

On the other hand the *genera causarum* were treated in the τέχνη ῥητορική in connection with *inventio*. Moreover *imitatio*, as being more closely connected with the functions of the orator than with his personality, was also treated in connection with the τέχνη (*ars*) rather than in connection with the τεχνίτης (*artifex*).³ Turning now to Horace's treatment of the dramatic genres, *Ars Poetica* 153-294, I am inclined to see in these genres a somewhat vague parallelism for the poetic art to the *genera causarum* for the oratorical art. Again, lines 119-152 are, it is true, as Barwick has recognized, dominated by the unifying conception of *imitatio*. Yet even this is not quite the whole truth, for

further study. For Lucilian relationships with the *Ars Poetica*, quite overlooked by all these scholars, see my *Lucilius and Horace*, pp. 446-468.

¹ *Hermes*, LVII (1922), pp. 1-62. For discussion of the influence on the *Ars Poetica* especially pp. 43 ff. and *infra*, pp. 7, 9, 23, 53, 57, 59, 60, 62, 68, 70.

² Φύσις, Μελέτη, Ἐπιστήμη in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, XL (1909), pp. 185-201. Barwick *op. cit.*, pp. 58 ff. Also *infra*, pp. 67 ff.

³ Barwick, *op. cit.*, pp. 46 ff.

they deal rather with the mutual correlatives *inventio-imitatio*. Thus Horace discusses the proper treatment (*tractatio*) of the dramatic genres, tragedy (153-219) and the satyr drama (219-250). While it is true that lines 119-152 deal with *imitatio*, yet this treatment carries with it a fresh treatment of *inventio* in connection with the dramatic genres, because the material for the drama is to be 'found' in epic. In fact Horace actually uses the term *publica materies* in line 132. This forms the natural transition to the discussion of the perfect *tractatio* or handling of his theme by Homer, as contrasted with the faulty *tractatio* of the cyclic poets (125-152).

An exact parallel to this argumentative sequence seems not to be found in Cicero's *Orator*, but the *De Oratore* 2, 162-178 seems to reveal a rather similar argumentative sequence. In 162-177, Antonius discusses one of the most important problems under *inventio*, the 'discovery' of the *topica*. He then insists (177) that the theme once 'found,' there should be variety in the treatment and that the points of juncture should be concealed:

interpuncta argumentorum plerumque occulas, ne quis ea numerare possit, ut re distinguantur, verbis confusa esse videantur.

We have here the rhetorical form of the well known precept *ars est celare artem*. I believe that Horace of set theory has illustrated this precept only too successfully in his *Ars Poetica*. In fact the whole Ciceronian paragraph affords so significant a commentary on Horace's rhetorical theories and practice that it should be read in connection with this argument.

Then, in 178, Antonius argues that to win the favor and sway the passions of the audience is the orator's goal, and after further postponing the problems of *ordo* and *dispositio* (179-181), he discusses the means of gaining that favor (182-184), and the importance of arousing the appropriate emotions in the minds of the audience. So Horace, after discussing the importance of the artistic fusion of truth and illusion, which mingle unity with variety (in lines 151-152), passes on to the means by which the attention and favor of the audience may be held until the curtain falls (153-178). This goal is to be attained by the proper study of the *ἦθος* of the characters to be presented on the stage. Cicero, however, continues with the supplementary question of *παθος* (185-214). Finally, like Horace in lines 101 ff.,

Cicero asserts (189-190) that the orator must himself feel the emotions which he attempts to excite. In virtue, then, of this general parallelism in argumentative sequence which I have been attempting to reproduce in outline, I regard the dramatic *genres* as having an integral place in the Horatian argument of the *Ars Poetica*, a place which has analogies with the similar topics treated in the τέχνη ῥητορική.¹

So far I have attempted to set forth the literary and rhetorical milieu of the *Orator* and the *Ars Poetica*. We may now turn to the detailed comparison of the two works. But first a few words of warning. The ebullient Cicero, with his unconquerable predilection for copiousness, will in many respects take a different attitude towards rhetorical tradition from the restrained Horace, who thanks the gods for his brevity.² Again, the diverse problems of poetry and oratory may involve a real divergence of treatment in spite of the fact that both arts to so large an extent breathe the circumambient atmosphere of rhetoric. Once more, it is to be remembered that this paper is a reconnaissance. It is not my purpose to compare the whole *corpus* of Cicero's rhetorical works with the *Ars Poetica*. Yet it is perhaps not superfluous to emphasize the fact that, in the rhetorical *corpus* of Cicero, the *De Inventione*, the *De Partitione Oratoria*, and the *Topica* deal rather with the *ars* or τέχνη, while the *De Oratore*, *Brutus*, and *Orator* deal rather with the formation of the perfect orator.

Even in the *Orator*, however, Cicero explicitly refers to several of the Greek philosophers and rhetoricians whose doctrines bulk so large in the rhetorical τέχνη.³ Such citations, combined with the clear evidence of his indebtedness to Plato,⁴ establish his relation to this long rhetorical tradition. Moreover, Cicero himself is familiar with the inescapable antithesis between the *ars* and the *artifex*. His immediate purpose in writing the *Orator* was quite as much to justify his own oratorical style as to wean Brutus from his extreme Atticism. Hence the disproportionate space allotted to the discussion of the *genera dicendi*.

¹ I do not agree with Barwick that the drama is, so to speak, a special case, with no particular relation to Horace's general thesis.

² *Serm.* 1, 4, 17 f.

³ In 172, he cites Isocrates, Aristotle, Theodectes, and Theophrastus; in 194, Ephorus, Theophrastus, and Theodectes; in 218, the same three again with Aristotle.

⁴ Cf. *infra*, pp. 15-21, 37, 46 note 3, 49, 55, 57, 59, 67, 70.

Quintilian complained, as we have seen,¹ that Cicero shortened sail, and rowed a slower stroke as he came to the actual description of his perfect orator. Cicero himself is perfectly conscious of this. Although in the *Epistulae ad Familiares* 15, 20, 1, and *De Divinatione* 2, 1, 4, he cites the work as *Orator*, in the *Epistulae ad Familiares* 12, 17, 2, and in *Ad Atticum* 14, 20, 3, he refers to the work as *De Optimo Genere Dicendi*. And such the work really was, 'camouflaged' under the title *Orator*, as a title connoting implications less invidious to Brutus. Finally, the argumentative sequence of the *Orator* is obviously influenced by the scheme of distribution of the argument under *inventio*, *dispositio*, etc.² found in the τέχνη ῥητορική.

Let us now turn to the detailed comparison of the two works. I shall in general follow the 'topical' sequence of the *Ars Poetica*. While the two works show certain striking similarities in argumentative sequence, they nevertheless also reveal a considerable diversity in the assignment of particular topics to their appropriate rubrics. Particularly within the central and comprehensive topic of *elocutio* important divergences appear. I shall therefore not hesitate where clearness demands it to deviate from the Horatian sequence of argument.

I shall first discuss two threads which run through the whole structure of the *Ars Poetica* — and to a lesser degree through that of the *Orator* — as through the warp of a cloth of richly diversified texture.³

The oration and the poem differ from the formal philosophical dialogue. Hence Cicero and Horace aim to write according to the technical classification of Aristotelian and post-Aristotelian rhetoric, not a λόγος πρὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα, but a λόγος πρὸς τοὺς ἀκροατάς. Their goal is a ψυχαγωγία; they aim to take captive the souls of their readers or audience.⁴ Horace transforms his tutorial relationship to the *Pisones*

¹ *Institut. Orat.* 12, *proem*, 4, and *supra* p. 2.

² See Kroll's analysis of the argument of the *Orator*, pp. 7 and 8 of his indispensable edition.

³ I shall not discuss the contrast between ὑπόθεσις (*res*) and σύνθεσις τῆς λέξεως (*verba*), that is, between subject matter and literary treatment, which, as Jensen has shown in his "Neoptolemos und Horaz," *Abhandlungen der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin) 1918, *philosophisch-historische Klasse*, n. 14, p. 43 ff. underlies the *Ars Poetica* and possibly the earlier work of Neoptolemus.

⁴ See Hendrickson: "Origin and Meaning of the Ancient Characters of Style," in the *American Journal of Philology*, XXVI (1905), pp. 274 ff.

into that of a kindly *paterfamilias*. Both writers deprecate the somewhat invidious rôle of the professional teacher of dogmatic rhetoric, philosophy, or poetics,¹ though Cicero had the courage to make a spirited defence of his longer excursion into the professional field. Cicero's attitude as expressed in 117 in the *Orator* is especially significant. So Horace (*Ars Poetica* 153-155) tells how the dramatic poet may gain the approval of his audience:

tu quid ego et populus mecum desideret audi,
si plausoris eges aulaea manentis et usque
sessuri, donec cantor 'vos plaudite' dicat.

As Kroll rightly observes, the aesthetic and philosophical theory of τὸ πρέπον or appropriateness, runs through the *Ars Poetica* like a red thread.² Hack³ analyzes the whole conception in detail, though with

¹ For a fuller discussion compare under the treatment of the *officia poetae*, *infra*, pp. 61-64. For the assumption of the rôle of admonitory critic rather than professional teacher compare Cicero *Orator* 43, 112, 117, and Sandys' note; also *De Oratore* 1, 132 (here Cicero says he speaks as a *paterfamilias*, an almost prophetic characterization of Horace's attitude towards the Pisones) *Ars Poetica* 121. For a fuller discussion of Horace's disinclination to assume the rôle of teacher, see the discussion below in connection with *Ars Poetica* 306 (pp. 51-53). For the part that the *voluptas aurium* has in gaining such an emotional appeal, see *Orator* 38, 159, 162, 198, 237. Cf. also *Ars Poetica* 97, where the abandonment of the *sesquipedalia verba* is advised, and 112 for the importance of congruity, if the audience are not to guffaw.

² Kroll, "Die historische Stellung von Horazens *Ars Poetica*," *Sokrates*, LXXII (1918), pp. 91-95. Thus lines 1-41 insist on the inner harmony and unity of the work, and the proper balance between the poet's powers and the theme he selects. In 73 ff. we learn that the metre must be appropriate to the subject matter. In 89 and 92, we are informed that: *versibus exponi tragicis res comica non vult; singula quaeque locum teneant sortita decentem*. In 105, we have the injunction that one should communicate his own emotions to his auditor by the appropriateness of the text to the moods and emotions of the actor. See pp. 30-33 below, under *actio*. In 108 ff. τὸ πρέπον dominates Horace's treatment of the ἡθικὴ λέξις. In 126 ff. and 151 ff. τὸ πρέπον determines the choice of material for the characters in tragedy and is the guiding principle of Homer. In 156 ff., Horace asserts the Aristotelian doctrine of the πρέπον ταῖς ἡλικίαις and describes (cf. Aristotle *Rhet.* 2, 12-14) the four ages of man. So also in the rules for the drama, e.g., the *deus ex machina* 191, the chorus, 194, and under the exposition of the aesthetics of the satyr drama, 225, 236, and 244 ff. Again in the *propositio* under the rubric *artifex* 306 ff., and finally in 312-316.

³ "The Doctrine of Literary Forms," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXVII(1916), pp. 21-22, 27, 39 in particular.

some asperity. I shall not retrace this ground. Instead I shall turn directly to Cicero's important discussion of the part which propriety or decorum should play in the equipment of the ideal orator. Cicero's *Orator* 70 ff. affords an apposite commentary on the actual position of Horace in *Ars Poetica*, and should be studied in this connection.¹

Cicero then continues from 72 to 74 his application of the principles of *πρέπον* to the problem of the perfect orator. He shows that *πρέπον* is concerned with the case as a whole, the personality of speaker, judge, and adversary (72). In 73, we learn that *πρέπον* is *par excellence* the quality of moderation and good taste. It is relative and not absolute. It works through the golden mean. It understands the little adverb *quatenus*. We use *oportere* of the absolute, the perfect, the *rectum*. We use *decere* in reference to the proprieties of time and person, of acts, words, bearing, carriage. What is inappropriate is avoided by poet and artist alike, even by the actor on the stage. How careful, then, must the orator be, both in his speech as a whole and in its parts. Then follows the exposition (76-99) of the three styles of oratory, which is thus seen to be in one sense nothing but the practical application of the principle of *πρέπον* to the particular problem which the orator must meet in handling a particular case against a particular opponent, under the presidency of a particular judge at a particular time and place.

This doctrine of *πρέπον* bulks large in the Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition of which Cicero and Horace are joint heirs. Aristotle treats it in some detail in his *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, and discusses it at length in his *Rhetoric* 3, 7. He arranges his material according to Pathos, Ethos, and the subject matter; the expression must be in harmony with the mood which one seeks to arouse in his audience, and with the age and position of the speaker. Theophrastus in his doctrine of the *ἀρεταὶ τῆς λέξεως* assigned *πρέπον* to the third place, after purity of diction and clearness, but before ornamentation. This system of Theophrastus exercised an important influence upon the rhetorical writings of Cicero,² Dionysius of Halicarnassus,³ and Quintilian.⁴

¹ Miss Grant, on page 240 of her unpublished thesis (University of Wisconsin, 1919), entitled *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable*, summarizes admirably the operation of the theory in relation to the Ciceronian and Horatian theories of wit and humor.

² Kroll, *op. cit.*, p. 93. ³ *De Compositione Verborum* 20. ⁴ *Institut. Orat.* 2, 1 ff.

It is interesting to notice that Philodemus,¹ who is assuredly one of the most important connecting lines between the rhetoric of Cicero and the (implicit) rhetoric of Horace, distinguishes between τὸ πρέπον τὸ κατὰ σοφίαν, and τὸ πρέπον καθ' ἑκάστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα. Just as Cicero (*Orator* 70) follows his insistence upon *sapientia* with an analysis of the importance of πρέπον in life and oratory; so Horace, who in 309 and 310 had asserted the fundamental importance of philosophy in general, and of the *Socraticae Chærtæ* in particular for the poet, sets forth what I shall call the *decorum vitæ* in 312-318.² That is, one who has studied philosophical theory, and kept in close touch with the various duties and actors of life will not fail in the understanding of the application of the aesthetic πρέπον whether in poetry or in oratory. Compare Cicero's: *huius ignorance non modo in vita, sed saepissime et in poematis et in oratione peccatur*, with Horace's lines 315-318.

In other words, we are here dealing with a well-worn rhetorical commonplace, which in the case of Horace is at least as early as Xenophon's treatment, in the *Memorabilia*,³ of the *officia* of life. It is a significant fact that Cicero, writing the *Orator* between January and April 46 B.C., and prior to the appearance of the *De Officiis* in the latter part of 44, probably hints at the projected work in the *Orator* 72: *itaque hunc locum longe et late patentem philosophi solent in officiis tractare . . . non cum de recto ipso disputant*. That is, *rectum* refers to the treatment of καθόρθωμα in the περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος of Panaetius, Cicero's principal source in his *De Officiis*. In my *Lucilius and Horace*, I endeavored to show that Lucilius was not uninfluenced by the teachings of decorum, as promulgated by Panaetius in the Scipionic circle, and was probably both directly and indirectly one of the formative influences moulding the Horatian theory of decorum.⁴

¹ Suss, *Ethos*, p. 186. Philodemus in Gomperz, *Sitzungsberichte der philos.-hist. Classe der kaiserl. Akad. der Wissensch.*, Viennâ, CXXIII (1891), 6, p. 12. See Kroll's note on *Orator* 70.

² Cicero, *De Oratore* 1, 12, 53 expresses the same idea of the *Comédie Humaine* in strikingly similar language. Cf. *infra*, pp. 56-58.

³ 2, 4-7, duties of friendship; 2, 2, love of parents; 2, 3, love of brothers; 3, 1, duties of the general; 1, 1, 18, of the judge and the senator.

⁴ See index under "Propriety," and especially p. 488. For Horace's familiarity with Panaetius, see *Carm.*, 1, 29.

In the *Orator* 123,¹ Cicero treats literary propriety or decorum as an important corollary to the doctrine of the plain style. Propriety results in variety and avoids monotony. Yet it insists on a harmonious texture. Similarly, in 228, the doctrine of propriety is emphasized in connection with Cicero's exposition of the rules of rhythmic prose. Rhythm must be adapted to the physiological pauses of the breath, to the sense pauses indicated by the *librarius*, and must vary in intensity with the thrust and parry of oratory.

This pervasive virtue of propriety will recur again and again in my treatment of the various '*partitiones*' of the *Ars Poetica*. I shall, therefore, content myself here with the somewhat fuller development of a few points supplementing my previous inventory of such sequences in the *Ars Poetica* dealing with this 'virtue.'² It is striking how closely Horace's concrete application of the theory of *πρέπον* to the art of poetry coincides even with certain of the sub-categories enumerated by Cicero in chapter 70 of the *Orator*. Norden³ rightly emphasizes the fact that in lines 86-130 Horace treats the doctrine of *πρέπον* in so far as the literary expression is concerned, which must on the one hand be appropriate to the *εἶδος* of the poem, on the other hand to the *πάθη* and *ἥθη* of the characters. Let us unravel from the closely woven warp of the *Ars Poetica* a few more indications of the pervasive influence of *πρέπον*.

Clearly the theory of decorum is operative in Horace's treatment of the dramatic *genres*. Of *actio*⁴ I shall speak below in detail. The explicit inventory of concise rules (179-205) governing dramatic actions and narration, the function of the chorus and of the musical accompaniment are probably strung together on the thread of *πρέπον*. Lines 120-127 obviously afford concrete illustration of Horace's adherence to Cicero's decorum of *personae*. Cicero's decorum of *fortuna* (71) finds explicit illustration in Horace's words (112):

si dicentis erunt fortunis absona dicta.

The decorum of the actor and auditor, as Cicero describes it in 71, is illustrated by Horace's lines 93-98. So Chremes on the comic stage

¹ Compare the important parallel passages which Kroll quotes from Theon: 115, 22, and 116, 15.

² Cf. *supra*, p. 11, note 2.

³ *Op. cit.* *Hermes*, XL (1905), p. 492.

⁴ *Infra*, pp. 30-.

under the compulsion of anger is permitted by the decorum which blends language with mood to rise temporarily to the language of tragedy. *Per contra*, the pathetic Telephus and Peleus discard the bombast of tragedy and employ the simple accents of the *genus tenue*. The decorum of position and *auctoritas* in Cicero's account, which Aristotle calls *ἔξις*,¹ and the decorum of age, which he calls *ἡλικία*, appear respectively in lines 114-118 and 156-178. In fact in 156 Horace himself declares:

aetatis cuiusque notandi sunt tibi mores,
mobilibusque decor naturis dandus et annis.

The fundamental decorum of life appears in lines 312-316.² Again in line 334 we are told that it is the *officium* of the poet³

aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae.

I have thus far shown that the poet and the orator, both in their subject matter and in their style, seek to make an emotional appeal to their audience. An important instrument in securing this appeal is *τὸ πρέπον* or *decus*, which seeks to charm and hold the attention of the audience by means of variety in the parts, but also by a sort of federated unity in the whole. Thus brevity, an outstanding virtue of the plain style, becomes associated with decorum. So Horace in lines 335-336:

quicquid praecipies, esto brevis, ut cito dicta,
percipiant animi dociles teneantque fideles.

Decorum will never overshoot the mark; as Cicero says, it knows the *quatenus*. Similarly Horace in line 337:

omne supervacuum pleno de pectore manat.

I wish now to show that Cicero's type of the perfect orator, and the Horatian antitype of the perfect poet, may be brought into direct relation with the doctrine of *τὸ πρέπον* or decorum, while both rubrics

¹ *Rhet.* 3, 7.

² *Infra*, pp. 56-58. On the decorum of life, Cicero's *De Oratore* I, 12, 53 is worth quoting: Quae nisi qui naturas hominum vimque omnem humanitatis causasque eas, quibus mentes aut incitantur aut reflectuntur, penitus perspexit, dicendo quod volet perficere non poterit.

³ *Infra*, pp. 60-64.

in turn are influenced by the Platonic theory of ideas. Cicero, in sketching the type of the perfect orator in 7-10, directly compares him to a Platonic idea. He can only adumbrate his outlines.¹ But this perfect orator is an antitype to the perfect poet, as Norden has shown by a careful comparative analysis of Horace's *Ars Poetica* 347-407 with several Ciceronian passages.² While rhetorical theory charitably permits the existence side by side of the *perfectus orator*, the *mediocris orator*, and even of the *malus orator*, poetical theory covers mediocrity with no such cloak of charity. It will be better to postpone the discussion of this fundamental divergence between the two theories for the moment, and merely to content ourselves with the citation of Horace's lines 366-373,³ in which the absolute standard of *rectum* is exacted of the poet, while a sliding scale is used to measure gradations of merit in jurisprudence and oratory. The first two lines of the passage must, however, be cited here:

O maior iuvenum, quamvis et voce paterna
fingeris ad rectum et per te sapis.

In this passage I believe that *rectum* is used of the ideal poet in precisely the same sense as Cicero in the *De Officiis*, I, 8, translates the Greek term κατόρθωμα *perfectum officium rectum opinor vocemus*. The *rectum*, as Kroll justly says,⁴ is the 'Vorbild' (or shall we say Platonic idea), while the decorum is the 'Abbild' which varies infinitely with the varying circumstances of actual life. Since Hack⁵ has so admirably analyzed the influence of the doctrine of Platonic ideas upon the *Orator* and the *Ars Poetica*, I shall not retrace that ground. I prefer to apply Hack's analysis to the first 44 lines of the *Ars Poetica*, for I believe that these lines, as well as the introductory chapters of the *Orator*, are dominated by the same Platonic conception.

In these lines Horace seeks to adumbrate the general philosophic

¹ *Orator* 7: atque ego in summo oratore fingendo talem informabo, qualis fortasse nemo fuit.

² *Op. cit.* in *Hermes*, XL, pp. 502-505. These passages are *Brutus* 193; *De Oratore* I, 25, 117; 2, 20, 85; 3, 56, 213. This ideal orator is the *orator quem quaeris* or the *perfectus orator*. Compare such passages as *Orator* 14, 69, 100, 133.

³ See *infra*, pp. 64-65.

⁴ Commentary on *Orator* 72.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 37-44 and *Orator* 7-10, 43, 52.

qualities of the ideal poem. This ideal poem is single, unified, and perfect. Compare lines 23-25:

denique sit quodvis, simplex dumtaxat et unum
maxima pars vatium, pater et iuvenes patre digni,
decipimur specie recti.

This illusive appearance or phenomenal apparition of perfection is due to the imperfect vision of the truth not seen through the eye of divine theory, but imperfectly attained by the empirical method. Empiricism hinders the attainment of the *summum bonum* of literary composition, unity. Without philosophy one can only have the phantasms of a fevered dream, not the waking vision of the truth. Compare lines 6 and 7:

credite, Pisones, isti tabulae fore librum
persimilem cuius velut aegri somnia vanae
finguntur species, ut nec pes nec caput uni
reddatur formae.

Notice the strong emphasis on the *uniformae*. Such an effort resembles that of the imperfectly trained craftsman, it is not the creation of the ideal ποιητής. As Quintilian, 8, 3, 56, says in a parallel passage, one is deceived by the *species boni*. We have a *κακόζηλον*, to use the technical term. And Horace's lines 25 ff. immediately following the identical *species recti*, are a perfect example of *κακόζηλον*. I am willing to grant Hack that Cicero may have had direct recourse to philosophy. I am not, however, willing to pronounce a ukase of ostracism against *Quellenforschungen*, for to my mind Barwick's investigation¹ has proved the strong admixture of Platonism in the τέχνη ῥητορική. It is not improbable that Cicero imbibed a rhetoricized Platonism from his academic teacher, Antiochus.

Again, the mediating doctrine of *πρέπον* or decorum is, so to speak, bifocal. In so far as it looks towards the unity of the Platonic idea, that is to the perfect oration or perfect poem which must be apprehended by pure reason, it is, as we have seen,² a *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν*. On the other hand, in so far as it looks to the welter of the phenomenal world of opinion, it is a *πρέπον καθ' ἑκάστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα*. It must therefore aim at variety in the parts as well as unity in the whole. Hack³ has correctly apprehended this mediating function of *πρέπον*

¹ *Hermes*, LVII, *op. cit.*, pp. 55 ff.

² *Supra*, pp. 11-13.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

between the one and the many, between the ideal form or *genus dicendi*, and the practice of forensic eloquence, between the poem and the ideal *genera* of poetry, between the poet's ideal and his practice, and I may add between the part and the whole. Hence decorum seeks a higher synthesis between the apparently conflicting claims of unity and variety. Unity is more apt to suffer at the expense of variety than variety at the expense of uniformity.¹ An incongruous or indecorous variety is more to be feared than a monotonous unity. It cannot be granted under the plea of the right to free composition. Today the American *literati* insist on nothing else! It is easier to be a mere craftsman and attain a mastery of the part, the individual *πρόσωπον* or *πράγμα*, than it is with the philosophic vision of the true artist to achieve a congruous variety which shall insensibly blend the parts into a unified whole. Horace, lines 8-12, will grant painters and poets *aequa potestas audendi*; Cicero will grant the orator and the poet '*licentia*'² in the exercise of their manifold functions, but neither will sacrifice unity to variety. One sinks to the level of the mere craftsman if he knows only the laws of man which mirror variety; he must also know the vision of unity. So Horace, lines 9-13:

'pictoribus atque poetis
quidlibet audendi semper fuit aequa potestas'
scimus, et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim;
sed non ut placidis coeant inmitia, non ut
serpentes avibus gementur, tigribus agni.

Still more striking is the precept of lines 29 and 30:

qui variare cupit rem prodigialiter unam,
delphinum silvis adpingit, fluctibus aprum.

Hence the 'purple patch' of epic description (lines 15-19), the cypress in the painting, to fill the demand of the shipwrecked sailor for a votive offering (19-21), or the potter's clay, beginning as an *amphora* and coming out as an *urceus* (21-22). The mere craftsman in bronze, Aemilius, can render nails and hair (32-35), but he is:

infelix operis summa, quia ponere totum
nesciet.

¹ For passages in the Ciceronian rhetorical *corpus* showing this interrelation between variety and unity compare *De Oratore* 2, 41, 177; *Orator* 102, 109; *De Partitione Oratoria* 47; *De Inventione* I.

² *Licentia* is a semi-technical term in the *Orator*, e.g. 68, 202.

So by analogy Horace (35-37) in literary composition would not be satisfied with the unsuccessful craftsmanship which combines fine black locks and dark eyes with a distorted nose.

One feels in these introductory lines of the *Ars Poetica* that the analogies of the graphic arts are employed for the same reason that Plato employs them so freely in his *Republic* in the exposition of his doctrine of ideas. Thus Horace begins the *Ars Poetica* concretely with the famous comparison (1-5) of the painter who combines the horse's neck with the human head, the animal's limbs with the bird's feathers, the beautiful woman with the black tail of the fish. Now Cicero, *Orator* 12, in an argumentative sequence steeped in Platonic coloring, asserts that his work comes, *non ex rhetorum officinis*, the shop of rhetorical craftsmen, but from the grove of the Academy. So Horace, 5, would disdain to be a mere *faber*, like Aemilius, 31-35. The true analogy in art for Horace's ideal poet is Phidias, who is an *artifex*, not an *opifex*.¹ Cicero tells us that Phidias in moulding a statue of Jupiter or Minerva was not copying an actual model, but, while employing various human models, he had in mind a *species pulchritudinis eximia quaedam, quam intuens in eaque defixus ad illius similitudinem artem et manum dirigebat*. In short, in both writers, to extend the apt observation of Heinze-Kiessling's note, *componere* means *totum ponere*.

Again, in *Orator* 36, Cicero uses a comparison derived from painting when considering the respective attainments of Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius. He likewise employs two complementary figures, that of the rhetoricized Platonic idea *χαρακτήρ*, and that of the artist's copy:

In picturis alios horrida inculta [abditā et] opaca, contra alios nitida laeta collustrata delectant: quid est quo praescriptum aliquod aut formulam exprimas, cum in suo quodque genere praestet et genera plura sint? hac ego religione non sum ab hoc conatu repulsus, existimaviq̄ue in omnibus rebus esse aliquid optimum, etiam si lateret, idque ab eo posse qui eius rei gnarus esset iudicari.

So in the somewhat parallel argumentative sequence in which Horace (lines 304 ff.) describes the formation and functions of the *perfectus poeta*, he first insists on the philosophy of the Academy (310) to give knowledge of the whole, the *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν*, then of detailed acquaintance with the infinitely varied *officia* of human life (311-317),

¹ See Hack, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXVII, p. 40.

the decorum of life. As Cicero seems to prefer the *χαρακτήρ Graecus* to the only partially successful copies of the early Romans, so Horace contrasts the artistic qualities of the Greeks (323-324) with the utilitarian education of the Romans (325-331). The Greeks are *avari laudis*, the Romans *avari peculi*. After then setting forth the *officia poetae*, a perfect analogue to Cicero's *officia oratoris*¹ (333-334), and showing how probably by virtue of the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκαστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα* these *officia* are to be related to the practical needs of literary composition and to the audience, Horace shows concretely how difficult it is to attain the ideal of the perfect poet (335-360), and finally (360), returns to the famous analogy *ut pictura poesis*. He thus acknowledges that the sister arts of literature and painting admit of variety within the higher limits set by the predominant doctrine of the *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν*, which in poetry demands that unity of Platonic ideal perfection, which has been transferred to the field of rhetoric and is operative within it. Lines 366 and following we have already discussed,² but the description of the variety of detail permitted the painter by what we should today call the principle of *chiaroscuro* (361-365) strikingly resembles Cicero's illustration from painting in 36, already quoted. Moreover, just as Horace passes from his illustration to the assertion of the absolute *rectum* (367), so Cicero passes on in the latter part of 36 to the rhetorical application of the Platonic theory of ideas.

So far I have tried to show (1) that the first 37 lines of Horace's *Ars Poetica* are permeated with the supplementary concepts of unity in the whole and variety in the parts. (2) That this unity of the Platonic idea is reconciled to the variety and beauty of life by the Janus-like doctrine of decorum, which is on the one hand a *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν*, derived from Plato, Aristotle, and the later philosophers and rhetoricians of the Academy and Peripatoi, on the other a *πρέπον καθ' ἑκαστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα*, based upon the modifying influence of rhetoric upon such theories, and perhaps decisively formulated for the Romans in the *περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος* of Panaetius. We may see, perhaps, a symbol of this ideal in the beautiful lines of Shelley's *Adonais*, themselves a Platonic myth in miniature:

"Life like a dome of many colored glass
Stains the white radiance of eternity."

¹ *Infra*, pp. 60-64.

² *Supra*, p. 16.

(3) I have shown, with somewhat fuller illustration than my predecessors, how these Platonic doctrines and their corollaries in the theory of decorum underlie both the Proem of Cicero's *Orator* and the first 37 lines of Horace's *Ars Poetica* (*De Arte*). (4) It is thus clear that, as Cicero (11-19) insists upon the fusion of philosophy with rhetoric and practical oratory in the training of the perfect orator, so Horace insists on the fusion of philosophy with the first-hand knowledge of life (310-318) because he is heir to the same aesthetic and rhetorical tradition. (5) While Horace, the ironic *σπουδαιογέλοιος*, presents his initial thesis (*de Arte*) by a series of concrete pictures which hold up the bad poem to ridicule, he yet gives us, under the parallel rubric of *artifex*,¹ a positive and even dogmatic exposition of the function of the perfect poet. On the other hand, Cicero, in keeping with his more impetuous temperament, proceeds explicitly to the announcement and development of his thesis.

I now turn to a comparison of the brief lines (38-41) which Horace devotes to *inventio* with the few sections (44-49) which Cicero devotes to this theme in the *Orator*. The Horatian lines may be quoted as my text:

sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, aequam
viribus, et versate diu, quid ferre recusent
quid valeant umeri. cui lecta potenter erit res,
nec facundia deseret hunc nec lucidus ordo.

It is at once obvious that these lines deal rather with *iudicium* than with *inventio* proper. Horace insists on the selection of a theme suitable to one's power and wise discrimination in rejecting what is unsuitable. Again the doctrine of decorum! So Cicero, *Orator* 44, couples *iudicare* with *invenire*. The matter is one of *prudentia* rather than of *eloquentia*. The two are described as *tamquam animi instar in corpore*. So Horace characteristically uses a similar corporeal metaphor on the interrelated functions of mind and body. Select by exercise of your *prudentia* a subject which your shoulders can bear.² Cicero then (45-49) proceeds to the discussion of the *topica*, naturally not a problem for the poet. Yet, in 47, he again asserts the importance of *iudicium*:

¹ See *infra*, pp. 45 to the end.

² Compare the other Horatian parallels on *vires* quoted by Heinze-Kiessling,⁴ line 39.

[doctissimus et perfectissimus orator] nec vero utetur imprudenter hac copia sed omnia expendet et seliget; non enim semper nec in omnibus causis ex isdem . . . argumentorum momenta sunt; iudicium igitur adhibebit nec inveniet solum quid dicat, sed etiam expendet.

Moreover in Cicero 47 we have the contrast between the poor and unphilosophical craftsman which pervades the first 37 lines of Horace's *Ars Poetica* summed up, as it were, by Cicero's contrast between the perfect orator and the *declamator aliquis de ludo aut rabula de foro*.

Horace treats *ordo*, which corresponds to the Ciceronian *collocatio*, summarily. He devotes to it only lines 41-45. *Ordo* will result (as well as *elocutio*) almost automatically from the judicious employment of the function of *inventio*. Its essential quality is clearness (*lucidus ordo*) that is, *claritas*, the *σαφήνεια* of Stoic rhetorical theory. But intimately allied with this virtue is brevity, *brevitas* (or *συνομιλία*), a second virtue of the Stoic rhetorical theory. It will say just the right thing and no more at just the right place. Equally brief is Cicero's treatment of *ordo*, which is limited to chapter 50 of the *Orator*. Both writers, then, are pushing rapidly forward *in medias res*, that is, into the thick of the complex and difficult problems of *elocutio*. Cicero's brief treatment of *ordo* illustrates the difference between the problems of the orator and those of the poet. The orator must put in prominent relief that which he wishes to emphasize, and slur over, by putting in less conspicuous places, arguments which are weak. It seems curious that Cicero omits the quality of brevity in chapter 50. Brevity, however, is found in the corresponding passage in the *De Oratore*, 2, 76, 307-381,¹ where Antonius discusses arrangement, especially in chapters 326 and 329. The latter passage corresponds much more closely with the Horatian injunction: *erit autem perspicua narratio si verbis usitatis, si ordine temporum servabit, si non interrupte narrabitur*.² Clearness, on the other hand, is attained rather by the employment of *verba pura*,

¹ In *Orator* 50, Cicero's *illustris aditus* may be compared with Horace's *lucidus ordo*. Sauppe supplies: *et perspicue breviterque narraverit*.

² Horace's treatment of brevity elsewhere must be interpreted in the light of the pervasive doctrine of decorum. See *infra*, p. 64 on *Ars Poetica* 335-337. For further Ciceronian passages dealing with brevity, see *Orator* 122, 139, *De Oratore* 1, 41, 187, and *Brutus* 66, where Cicero points out that brevity may be purchased at the price of clarity (witness Tacitus). Compare Horace, *Ars Poetica* 25: *brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio*, and *De Oratore* 2, 80, 326.

and by the employment of a not overelaborate periodic structure, whether we consider the sentence from the argumentative or the rhythmical point of view.¹

With Cicero and Horace, we have now reached the central and exhaustive topic of *elocutio*. As an aid to clearness I shall first discuss briefly the schemes of disposition employed by Cicero and by Horace. In Horace this topic extends from 45-118;² in Cicero from 51-236. Within this division Horace first discusses (46-72) diction or *ἐκλογή ὀνομάτων*. Then follows a section (73-85) which deals with the *περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων*, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus would call it, that is, *de verbis continuatis* or *de metris*, historically considered. So in the corresponding sections in the *Orator*³ we find Cicero first discussing *verba* as such (134), next (149-164) considering the euphonic qualities of individual words in relation to the *σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων*, and finally treating what in rhythmic prose corresponds to metre in verse, namely (a) the parallelism of the *cola* (164-167), (b) the rhythm of the 'period' (168-236).

Horace then continues (86-98), with the discussion of the application of what the ancients would probably call the *λεκτικὸς τόπος* to the various *vices*, formed by the metrical discrimination of the poetic *genres*. That is, he considers how the *inventores* of these *genres* fused a particular poetic style with a particular metrical form, which fusion constitutes the doctrine of the *operum colores*. Then *elocutio*, as always, following the doctrine of *πρέπον*, seeks a style harmonious with (a) the *εἶδη* of the *genre*, (b) the *πάθη* of the persons on the stage and in the audience (99-113), (c) the *ἥθη* of the characters on the stage (114-118). Then follows a passage (119-152) which with Barwick we may entitle *de imitatione* if we will, but which we have seen⁴ forms the transition

¹ Cicero *De Oratore* 3, 13, 48 and 49.

² Norden is wrong in ending *elocutio* at line 130. See Barwick, *op. cit.*, *Hermes* LVII (1922), p. 46.

³ I prefer to follow the more detailed analysis of the *Orator* in Kroll's introduction, p. 8. Norden, *op. cit.*, p. 492, ignores the triple division of the *ἐκλογή ὀνομάτων*. While Cicero treats the *σχήματα λέξεως* (135) and the *σχήματα διανοίας* (136-139), Horace has no corresponding section on metaphor or figures of speech, though in the treatment of the satyr drama (234 ff.), he incidentally asserts his intention to permit a somewhat freer use of metaphorical language than in comedy, which falls under the *genus tenue*.

⁴ *Supra*, pp. 7-8; *infra*, pp. 36-38.

to the various dramatic *genres*. Then follows a consideration of the *genera poematum* extending from 153 to 294.

This section treats comedy, which produces its effect mainly by *ἥθος* or character delineation and approaches the plain style, in lines 153-178.¹ Tragedy, which is related to the grand style in language and in musical accompaniment, is treated in lines 179-219. The satyr play, which Horace would have correspond to the middle style, and possibly relate to the *fabula Atellana*, follows in lines 220-250. Then comes a considerable sketch of the Roman drama, 251-274. This sketch is subdivided into (a) a consideration of metrical forms 251-269 as used by the Romans in their dramatic genres; (b) a series of transitional lines dealing with the humor of Plautus, and contrasting his rhythms and metres with those used by the Greeks, 270-274. Then follows an historical account of the development of tragedy and the Old Comedy among the Greeks, 275-284, and of the development of the corresponding dramatic forms, the *praetexta* and the *togata* among the Romans, 285-294.

Turning now to the schematization of Cicero's *Orator* we find — and quite naturally — a rather different disposition of the matter discussed under *elocutio*. The exposition begins, 51-54, with a brief section on *actio*, which, as I shall show presently,² has decidedly influenced Horace's treatment of the drama, lines 86-111. Then follow the reasons for eliminating from consideration the style of philosophers, sophists, historians, and poets, 62-68, sections which have an incidental influence upon Horace's treatment of similar themes. Finally we reach what corresponds very closely to the argumentative sequence with which Horace, lines 305-308,³ defines the *officia* of the perfect poet.⁴ The *officium* of Cicero's antitype, the perfect orator, is *probare*, *delectare*, *flectere*, and these three objectives are systematically related to the doctrine of *πρόπον*, which leads to the discrimination of the three *genera dicendi*, 69-75. These are, as successively described, the *genus tenue*, 76-90, the *genus medium*, 91-96, and the *genus grande*, 97-99. The perfect orator must be master of all three styles, 100-112, and

¹ *Infra*, pp. 33-36.

² *Infra*, pp. 30-33.

³ Lines 295-305 of the *Ars Poetica* are transitional.

⁴ *Infra*, 61-64, for a detailed treatment.

possess a broad and liberal training, embracing philosophy, law, and history, 113-120.

There is, of course, a general correspondence between the grand style and epic and tragedy, the middle style and satyr drama, the plain style and the new comedy. Horace's treatment of these genres will therefore show certain broad resemblances to the Ciceronian formulation of the doctrine of the three styles. In general we may say that it is the duty of each of the dramatic genres to convince, to delight, to move. Yet in a special sense it is the function of comedy to convince by fidelity to life, and to delight by the *ἥθος* of the comic types. On the other hand, tragedy 'moves' by fidelity to the doctrine of *πάθος*. I shall therefore attempt presently to consider the relation of Horace's treatment of the dramatic genres to the theory of the three styles.

We have already seen¹ that Cicero treats the *ἐκλογὴ ὀνομάτων* in three separate contexts. Horace likewise, though following a simpler schematization, treats this topic first in lines 45-72 at the beginning of the rubric *elocutio*. He then returns to a consideration of words, as made up of long and short syllables, in lines 251-262. Just as Horace then proceeds to the discussion of early Roman metres and humor 263-268, so Cicero follows his treatment of the euphony of individual words (149-164) by the discussion of the parallelism of *cola* (174-176) and the rhythm of the period (168-236).

Here, then, we find many similarities, but also many differences. My procedure will be to discuss each topic following the Horatian sequence and comparing Horace's treatment with the corresponding Ciceronian treatment, even though that treatment be subdivided under several rubrics.² I turn first to a consideration of the question of diction, *ἐκλογὴ ὀνομάτων*.

In my book on *Lucilius and Horace*,³ I have already given a detailed discussion of Horace's theory of diction in the *Ars Poetica*, *Serm.* 1, 4, and 1, 10 and 2, 1, and have compared the influence of Cicero's doctrines as expounded in the *Orator* 80, 81, and 152, and the *De Oratore* 3, 37, 149. Considerations of space forbid any repetition of that argu-

¹ *Supra*, p. 23.

² In some instances I shall combine Horatian material from disparate rubrics in the *Ars Poetica*.

³ See especially pp. 450-456.

ment here. So far as the theory of diction impinges upon that of the plain style or *genus tenue*, as described by Cicero in 76-90, I am still inclined to believe that, as a *tenuis poeta* in his *Sermones* and *Epistulae* and even to a degree in his *Odes*, Horace followed a theory of diction which is in essential harmony with that of the *tenuis orator* as sketched by Cicero. I am now inclined to think that the "fundamentalists" of Atticism such as Brutus or Pollio (?) might not have given complete approval to the more eclectic purism of Cicero's *tenuis orator* or to Horace's creed of the *tenuis poeta*. Perhaps Horace's point of view as to diction would be nearer to that of Cicero, who is himself an eclectic purist, so to speak. Moreover, both men are in general anomalists and apparently adopt an opportunistic attitude to problems where good usage and euphony come into conflict.

As to the extent to which metaphorical language is permitted within the limits of the plain style we may compare what Cicero says in chapter 80 of the *Orator* (*ornatus autem <verborum> duplex, unum simplicium, alter collocatorum*) with Horace's announcement of his intention, in *Serm.* 1, 4, 54, to use *verba pura*. That is, the *sermo* demands not merely words which are approved by the standard of *Latinitas*, on which the *genus tenue* rests, but also words *sine ornamentis*, that is, ὀνόματα καθάρᾳ or κύρια, as they are called in Greek rhetorical theory,¹ words used in their literal and non-figurative sense. Yet later in the *Ars Poetica*, Horace, while describing the appropriate style for the satyr drama (lines 234-235), declares that he will not confine himself to such *verba dominantia* (or ὀνόματα κύρια):

non ego inornata et dominantia nomina solum
verbaque, Piones, satyrorum scriptor amabo.

Moreover, if we may lay any stress on the matter of ornamentation as secured by *iunctura* (deft combinations of words and sounds) which Cicero describes in 77, the plain style would permit hiatus in prose and would avoid undue care about the clash of vowels. It is a style, '*simplex munditiis*,' if we may trust Cicero's words in the *Orator* 79: *elegantia modo et munditia remanebit*. Nor must we forget that *elegantia* resides perhaps primarily in the matter of diction. It would

¹ See Paul Geigenmueller: *Quaestiones Dionysianae de vocabulis artis criticae*, s.v. *purus*; p. 10, καθάρᾳ, pp. 13, 17, 26; κύριος, pp. 15, 21.

seem, therefore, that the convinced adherent of the plain style might possibly be more chary than is Horace in the theoretical discussion of the *Ars Poetica* and in actual practice elsewhere, in imitating what, in the *Ars Poetica* 47 and 48, he calls *callida iunctura*.¹ On the other hand, even the more rigid Atticists would approve of Horace's dictum in line 240:²

ex noto fictum carmen sequar, ut sibi quivis
speret idem, sudet multum frustra que laboret
ausus idem.

This is the famous *subtilitas* of the plain style described by Cicero in 76: *nam orationis subtilitas imitabilis illa quidem videtur esse existimanti, sed nihil est experienti minus*. Note the identity of the Ciceronian and Horatian idea. Thus Sir Walter Scott naively confessed both his virtuosity in the big 'bow-wow' style and his inability to attain the style of Jane Austen. A Latin rhetorician might say that he lacked both her *subtilitas* and her *sal*.

I know of no study of Horatian style which discusses and classifies Horace's use of metaphor and figures of speech and rhetoric with reference to Cicero's treatment of metaphor and the *σχήματα λέξεως* and *σχήματα διαβολας* (*Orator* 81-86). Impressionism is of little value in such matters. However, as a somewhat experienced student of Horatian satire, I will raise the question whether in this matter Horace was not, to adopt his own metaphor in line 28 of the *Ars Poetica*, *timidus procellae*. With these lines we may well compare the contrasting stanzas 25-28, and 29-32 of *Odes* 4, 2, in which Horace sets his own delicate and conscientious art over against the lofty sweep of the cloud-defying Pindar. Even in the *Odes*, Horace does not often venture too far from the ground. Let me point out, however, if I understand correctly the quality of *ἐνάργεια* (which Cicero's *Orator* describes in 139 as: *saepe etiam rem dicendo subiecit oculis*), that in the whole introductory passage of the *Ars Poetica* (1-37), Horace by his constant employment of visual images, taken from the arts of painting and sculpture, seems to show us the *ineptus poeta* at work in his *atelier* upon a modern masterpiece of incongruous variety.

¹ Cf. also *Ars Poetica*, 242.

² Cf. also Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Lysias (*De Imitatione* 5, p. 211, 17).

I turn next to the scattering indications of Horace's attitude towards phonetic and prosodic questions. Here Cicero as usual speaks much more *ex cathedra* than Horace does. We have already seen that in treating diction¹ Horace adopted the attitude of the anomalist rather than that of the analogist. This is natural enough for one of his urbane temperament. At the same time the fact that Neoptolemus of Parium stood in close relation to the school of Pergamum may also have had some influence. We might almost call lines 60-72 of the *Ars Poetica*, comparing them with Cicero's *Orator* 162, *locus de natura et usu verborum*. So Horace discusses *usus* in line 71, and gives us a beautiful simile drawn from nature in lines 60 ff. In this connection it is interesting to notice that the last two categories used by Cicero in his discussion of the rhythm of the period are *natura*, 179-203, and *usus*, 204-236.

Now in this matter of verse and prose music the claims of sound and good usage may conflict. Witness the admiration of many persons for Vachel Lindsay's verses on the 'Congo Nigger.' Cicero is perfectly conscious of this conflict of criteria. In chapters 149-162 of the *Orator*, he returns to the discussion of ἐκλογή ὀνομάτων from the point of view of euphony. One must, he holds, avoid too obvious a straining for effect. Yet in 153 he prefers the criterion of *aures* to that of *usus*. Again, in 157, Cicero does not seriously object to *scripsere*, but prefers to 'pander' to *consuetudo* rather than to *aures*. On the other hand in the case of *isdem* vs. *idem* in the nominative case, euphony wins over usage. In the *Orator* 160, Cicero asserts positively: *voluptati autem aurium morigerari debet oratio*. In 162, he declares that subject matter and diction depend on *prudentia*: *vocum autem et numerorum aures sunt iudices, et quod illa ad intelligentiam referuntur, haec ad voluptatem, in illis invenit, in his sensus artem*. So he asserts (163): *legenda sunt potissimum bene sonantia sed ea non, ut poetae exquisita ad sonum, sed de medio sumpta*. So Philodemus περὶ ποιημάτων 259, 18 H., who stands midway between Cicero and Horace, says in a similar context: ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων οἰκεῖα ῥήματα παραινεῖ λαμβάνειν. It is a striking fact that Horace, even though a poet, prefers to follow the usage of the rhetorical theory of the plain style rather than to follow such an

¹ *Supra*, p. 26.

injunction contained in the poetic art of Philodemus.¹ Yet in line 100, Horace recognizes the importance of sound when he says:

non satis est pulchra esse poemata: dulcia sunt
et quocumque volent animum auditoris agunto.

For surely the *ampulla* and *sesquipedalia verba* of tragedy (line 97), even if poets do have greater license in the matter of forming compounds (so Cicero *Orator* 68) are an offense against the *voluptas aurium*.²

Yet even here Horace, the *sanus poeta*, holds, perhaps against the poetic theory of the Epicureans, that an inartistic and unimpressive (*sine pondere*) production will meet with more approval than tuneful trifles, if only it has striking stylistic passages and good delineation of character (318-322). Yet he had a strict metrical conscience, as we may see when in line 274 he condemns as lacking in refinement the rhythms of Plautus (as well as his wit). Horace must have had his opinion of Cicero's verses, even though metrically they represent an advance over earlier poetry. Cicero, *Orator* 152, had criticized the Greeks, Thucydides and Plato, in contrast even to the earlier Romans, for their laxity in the matter of hiatus. Horace, however, in spite of such blemishes,³ has a much higher opinion of the Greeks and a much lower opinion of early Latin poetry.⁴

We are naturally not to expect any exact and detailed parallelism between Cicero's treatment of prose rhythms and the indications of metrical theory scattered through the *Ars Poetica*. Yet both writers, in accordance with the technique of Alexandrian rhetoric and poetics, discuss the problem of the *εὐρεσις* of prose rhythm, and the various poetic *genres*. Thus Cicero in the *Orator* (174-176), while giving especial praise to Isocrates as the noble 'continuator' of the great tradition of prose rhythm, names Thrasymachus and Gorgias as the

¹ For *οἰκεῖα* see also *Ars Poetica*, 243 *de medio*.

² Cf. Philodemus *περὶ ποιημάτων* 265, 2.

³ For Horace's reasoned judgment see *Epist.* 2, 1 *passim*. For his judgment on hiatus see *Ars Poetica*, 139-140.

⁴ For Horace's attitude towards the assumed superiority of Greek vocalism see *Serm.* 1, 10, 22-35, and especially Hendrickson's article "Horace and Valerius Cato" in *Classical Philology*, XII (1918), pp. 329-350. In several passages in the *Orator* Cicero uses the term *ad voluptatem aurium*, e.g. 38, 150, 159, 162, 198, 203, 208, 237.

actual *εὐπραλ*. So in *Ars Poetica* (73-85), Horace names the inventors of the various poetic genres.

In line 252, Horace takes up the consideration of the *iambus*, the basic foot, alike of the tragic dialogue and of the *diverbium* in comedy.¹ In passing to the Roman tragedies of Accius and Ennius, Horace criticizes their excessive license in the admission of the irrational spondee. In the trimeters of Accius a pure iambic is rare indeed, while Ennius, he declares, sends his verses to the stage with a heavy load of spondees. He was either over hasty and careless in metrical composition, or he was entirely ignorant of the rules of the art. But surely to have escaped detection at the hands of a pupil, is no real excuse for the *poeta*. Even to go as far as you dare with the public is little better. The Pisones should study the masterpieces of the Greeks by day and by night, as Horace himself has studied Sappho and Alcaeus for his lyrics. But it is urged that our ancestors admired not only the wit, but the numbers of Plautus. Their ear for rhythm was as indiscriminating as their taste in wit and humor. If you and I have advanced to the appreciation of the liberal jest, and have attained a nicer ear for rhythm — why, for us the conclusion is obvious.²

In discussing the sporadic instances of Horace's metrical doctrines we have perforce skipped about in the various *partitiones* of the *Ars Poetica*. Let us now retrace our steps to line 86, and consider the problems which Greco-Roman rhetorical and poetical theory raised in connection with the three rubrics of *ῥηθός*, *πάθος*, and *actio*. I shall consider the last rubric first.

Actio or delivery is closely related to *ῥηθός* and *πάθος*, whether from the point of view of the actor or of the orator. It embraces the harmonious blending of voice, bearing, facial expression, gesture, and style into an artistic whole which, by its unity and variety, shall take captive the souls of the audience. Cicero, therefore (55-60), very properly begins his exposition of *elocutio* with a discussion of *actio*. Horace has no formal section in the *Ars Poetica* precisely corresponding to Cicero's treatment of *actio*. Nevertheless the general course of this argument

¹ See Heinze-Kiessling *ad loc.*, in proof of Horace's metrical knowledge.

² My analysis deals with the passage extending from 263 to 274. Considerations of space have led me to omit certain passing points of contact between Cicero's treatment of prose rhythm and Horace's metrical theories.

from lines 86-111 is strongly impregnated with the doctrine of *actio*.¹ Surely *actio*, when combined with an appropriate *elocutio*, is one of the most effective means by which one in accordance with the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκαστον πρόσωπον* may observe what Horace in line 86 calls the *descriptas vices operumque colores*. With some hesitation and in this strictly limited sense, which makes *actio* corroborative of the total effect produced by the metrical form and the stylistic *ῥῆθος*, I am inclined to add to Norden's designation of these protean lines *vel de actione*, and make my rubric read *de coloribus operum vel de actione*.

But first we must summarize Cicero's argument. *Actio*, he declares in 54, is the eloquence of the body expressed by voice and movement. But the changes of tone and pitch in the voice are outward *indices* of the changes of mood. With gesture facial expression goes hand in hand. These three — voice, gesture, facial expression — are the three supple instruments of *actio*. No wonder then that Demosthenes laid primary stress on *actio*. Hence arises the doctrine of the three tones or accents, *inflexus*, *acutus*, *gravis*. In 59, Cicero expounds natural accent. But art, he declares, must supplement nature and produce a varied and pleasing tone color, as we should say today: The fundamental principle is variety. Therefore Cicero (59) declares of his oratorical 'prince': *ergo ille princeps variabit et mutabit*. So Horace announces his fundamental principle in 92:

singula quaeque locum teneant sortita decentem.

This principle is varied unity. Clearly, then, both Horace and Cicero are describing a symphonic procedure, in strict keeping with the law of decorum.

Cicero then proceeds to give us in 59 some interesting practical suggestions on the management (1) of the *vox*, (2) of *motus*, (3) of *voltus*. Facial expression is of especial importance, though ancillary to the modulation of the voice. Cicero feels² that the face must not change too much, and that the eyes are the *indices animi*. Grimaces must be avoided.

We have just seen³ how Horace's doctrine of the *vices operumque*

¹ After noting this fact, I was interested to find that Kroll, *op. cit.*, *Sokrates*, LXXII, p. 93, had made the same observation in commenting on the *Ars Poetica*, 105.

² *Orator*, 60.

³ *Supra*, pp. 23, 29.

colores from Homer down involves the harmony of an appropriate metre with an appropriate λέξις. Yet even within the metrical limits of the *genres*, monotony must be avoided. Hence in comedy, which, as Horace well knows, is nearer the level of the *sermo*, we ordinarily, as Cicero says,¹ employ a *vox remissus*. But in lines 93-94 Horace declares:²

interdum tamen et vocem comoedia tollit
iratusque Chremes tumido delitiget voce.

So Cicero says in 56: *volet igitur ille, qui eloquentiae principatum petet, et contenta voce atrociter dicere et summissa leniter et inclinata videri gravis et inflexa miserabilis*. By *contenta voce*,³ Cicero means 'an elevated, vehement, intense tone of voice'; by *summissa leniter*, he means 'gently, in a quiet, subdued tone'; by *inclinata* an effort to attain dignity by a deep tone; by *inflexa*, an effort to attain pathos by plaintive modulation. So also Horace tells us (95-98), that in pathetic passages the tone and diction are lowered to the simplicities of daily life:

et tragicus plerumque dolet sermone pedestri,
Telephus et Peleus cum pauper et exul uterque
proicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba,
si curat cor spectantis tetigisse querella.

It is not by diction and theme alone that an emotional appeal reaches the audience; ancient psychology demands also grace, as well as nobility. By the lines and the moving tone of the voice the actor-poet — and the early Greek tragic writers were masters of acting and orchestrics — leads captive the soul of his audience. Compare with *animum agunto* in line 100 the ψυχαγωγεῖν of Greek rhetorical theory. But these instruments must first have been tempered in the sympathetic heart of the poet himself (99-101). The expression of the human face is all-important, for it is the index of the soul (101):

ut ridentibus adrident, ita flentibus adflent
humani voltus.

But the sympathy (or 'fellow feeling' in the literal sense of the word) of the author is the prerequisite to the highest *actio* (101-105):

¹ *Orator* 59; cf. *De Oratore* 3, 61, 227.

² Cf. also *Serm.* 1, 4, 48 ff.

³ See Sandys' excellent note.

si vis me flere, dolendumst
 primum ipsi tibi: tum tua me infortunia laedent,
 Telephe vel Peleu: male si mandata loqueris,
 aut dormitabo aut ridebo.

Language and facial expression, as Horace goes on to show (106 ff.), must coincide; the dolorous mien with the dolorous word, the angry mien with the threatening word, the solemn mien with the utterance of high seriousness, the gay mien with the sportive word.

Imperceptibly Horace has led us on from the externals — the moving human externals with which the actor deals — to that inner sanctuary where the whole theory of pathos and art is tempered in the glowing crucible of the artist's heart, but is directed, too, by his intelligence. For in a truly classic art, feeling and thought are fused; they do not dwell in hostile camps. Horace thus passes on by one of those imperceptible, fluid transitions (108-113) which make the analysis of the *Ars Poetica* so difficult, to the consideration of the doctrine of pathos, the λέξις παθητική, developed in ultimate analysis in accordance with the doctrine of appropriateness or decorum, as found in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* III, 7:

format enim natura prius nos intus ad omnem
 fortunarum habitum; iuvat aut impellit ad iram,
 aut ad humum maerore gravi deducit et angit:
 post effert animi motus interprete lingua
 si dicentis erunt fortunis absona dicta,
 Romani tollent equites peditesque cachinnum.

But sometimes it is otherwise, and soul speaks to soul through thought, and word, and look and mien. In this sense is not the drama perhaps the most humane of all the arts, humane in the possibilities and limitations of its instruments, humane because it is the *simulacrum* of our common humanity?

I turn next to the part that the supplementary doctrines of ἦθος and πάθος play in the rhetorical theories of Cicero and the poetical theories of Horace. The point of view of both writers is derived in ultimate analysis from the discussion of the ἡθικὴ λέξις and the παθητικὴ λέξις in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* 3, 7, where these two categories are treated under the doctrine of πρέπον. Later rhetorical theory widened very much the earlier Aristotelian conceptions of which I shall treat first.¹

¹ Cf. Heinze-Kiessling⁴ on Horace's *Ars Poetica* 114.

I must omit a consideration of the relation of the doctrines of ἥθος and πάθος to Cicero's early rhetoric of syllogistic proof.¹ Miss Grant will show in her as yet unpublished thesis *On Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable*: (1) that the *officium* of the λόγος πρὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα is *docere* or *probare*; (2) that the ἥθος, resident in the character of the orator himself, or in the case of the dramatic genres, in the *dramatis personae*, is *delectare*; (3) that πάθος addressed to the audience in the theatre, court, or forum, is related to the *officium* entitled *flectere* or *movere*. Cicero first considers these three *officia oratoris* in the *De Oratore* 2, 27, 115, but he analyzes them much more narrowly in the *Orator* 69-75. Horace's *officia poetae* are conveniently summarized in lines 333-334. They are, of course, as we shall see below,² clearly derivative from rhetorical theory and in consequence a perfect analogue to the *officia oratoris* of Cicero. Thanks to Jensen we now know that either Neoptolemus or at least certain of the rhetoricians criticized by Philodemus had formulated the same doctrine. After analyzing in great detail the technical terms applied to both ἥθος and πάθος in Cicero's rhetorical works, Miss Grant goes on to prove that ἥθος is rather characteristic of the *sermo*, one of the most highly developed genres under the plain style. With the plain style as a whole and with the *sermo* in particular is connected the theory of the restrained or liberal jest. On the other hand πάθος is more commonly connected with the *contentio*, associated with the grand style. Indeed in the *Orator* (109), Cicero applies the term *contentio* to the epic and tragic poets as well as to the speech of the orator. The *contentio* aims at exciting an emotional effect. The *sermo*, on the contrary, aims at relaxing emotional tension — at least the *sermo apta ad docendum et delectandum*, such as a Platonic dialogue or an Horatian satire — by an exhibition of character, whether in the orator himself, in the personages he depicts, especially in his *narratio*, or in the characters produced by the poets on the comic stage. Such characters must, therefore, as we say, be true to life, but they may be humorously depicted, for humor tends to relax tension, as Horace Walpole said: "Life is a comedy to all who

¹ Sandys' excellent note on Cicero *Orator* 128, and a general reference to Barwick, *Hermes*, LVII (1922), pp. 1-62, "Die Gliederung der rhetorischen τέχνη und die horazische *Epistula ad Pisones*," *passim*, must suffice.

² *Infra*, pp. 61-64.

think." Consequently we are not surprised to find that Cicero, in 87-90, treats briefly the liberal jest, as one of the common instruments of the *genus tenue*, or plain style.

It will be found that Horace's theory of *ἦθος* is in complete conformity with such doctrines of Aristotle, Hellenistic rhetoric, and Cicero. Cicero (*Orator* 128) describes the *ἠθικόν* as *ad naturas et ad mores et ad omnem vitae consuetudinem accommodatum*. Its tone is *come, iucundum, ad benevolentiam conciliandum paratum*. Supplementing the Aristotelian classification, Dionysius in his *τέχνη* made a classification by *ἔθνη, γένη, ἡλικίαι, προαιρέσεις, τύχαι, ἐπιτηδεύσεις*. Horace clearly has similar categories in mind in his *Ars Poetica* 114-118, as Heinze-Kiessling have seen.

Similarly in *Ars Poetica* 156-178, we have a designation in greater detail of the four stages of man, and the appropriate character delineation for each stage. This is clearly the *ἦθος καθ' ἡλικίαν*, as we may see by the fact that character changes with the passage of the years (175-178). The stages thus indicated are the *puer* (158-160), the *adulescens* (161-165), the *vir* (166-168), the *senex* (169-174). Of the underlying principle of delineation Horace himself declares in 178:

semper in adiunctis aevoque morabimur aptis.

That is, the variety of the age merges in the larger harmony of life, in accordance with the doctrine of decorum which here as usual wears its Janus-like aspect, *κατὰ σοφίαν* and yet more clearly *καθ' ἕκαστον πρόσωπον*. With the exception of the *puer*, a type which Horace could hardly omit, the passage seems to breathe the atmosphere of the New Comedy which like the *sermo* holds the mirror up to life.¹

Between these two passages on *ἦθος*, Horace has put another passage (120-124) on the types of tragedy, which clearly mirrors not the gradual transformation of the year, but the influence on character of the consuming master passions; these types, to be sure, are amenable to the theories of *ἦθος*, but they are suitable for the grand style of tragedy in which *πάθος* disputes the throne. Notice the epithets, *impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer, ferox, invicta, flexibilis, perfidus*,

¹ Cf. Lucilius, fragment 1029 Marx: *sicuti te, qui ea quae speciem vitae esse putamus, apparently an allusion to the New Comedy; see my Lucilius and Horace, p. 289.*

vaga, tristis. Each epithet typifies even before it is attached to its name a human emotion or a mode of human behavior.¹

Cicero (128) correctly characterizes the general nature of the *παθητικόν*, as *vehemens, incensum, incitatum*, words which may serve as summaries for Horace's fuller panoply of adjectives in lines 120-124. How important a part *πάθος* played in the transitional section on *actio* we have already seen.² Moreover, Horace is perfectly in sympathy with Cicero's doctrine (*Orator* 132) that one must first feel the emotion which he would arouse: *neque umquam is qui audiret incenderetur, nisi ardens ad eum perveniret oratio*. This we may see by quoting once more the famous Horatian line, *Ars Poetica* 102:

si vis me flere dolendumst
primum ipsi tibi.³

I turn next to the question of *imitatio* or imitation. As Vahlen saw,⁴ the verses from 119-152 form a unity. This unity, however, is animated by the relation of the problem of *imitatio* to the various dramatic genres immediately treated (153-294). This is a unity which, as Barwick says, stands in close relation to the treatment of *imitatio* in the *τέχνη* of rhetoric.⁵ Moreover, since the subject matter of tragedy is derived from Homer, the description of Homeric poetry and the Cyclic epic (136-152) is not only an indication of the laws of epic composition, but is also really an indication that the writer of tragedy will find (*inventio*) his subject matter in the Homeric epic. His method of treatment, *tractatio*, will be that of Homer rather than that of the Cyclic poets. One should likewise notice that this passage, as we have just seen, is closely bound up with the preceding lines on the *ῥητορικὴ λέξις* by virtue of the suture of lines 119-124. Homer, as rhetoric and philosophy both asserted, is the perfect poet. That Horace himself

¹ As Heinze-Kiessling⁴ rightly observe, line 119 is at once a summary of what has preceded and a transition to the topic of *imitatio* which, as Barwick correctly saw, begins with 119 and, interwoven with the treatment of *ῥηθός* and *πάθος* from lines 119-124, continues as far as 152.

² On *actio* see *supra*, pp. 30-33.

³ Compare also on *ῥηθός* and *πάθος*, *De Oratore* 1, 12, 53; 2, 41, 176; 44, 185; 45, 189.

⁴ *Sitzungsbericht d. Akad. der Wissenschaft zu Berlin, philosophische-historische Klasse* 1906, p. 602.

⁵ Barwick, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

had imbibed this attitude towards Homer from the Stoics is abundantly shown by his *Epistles* (1, 2), which deal with the works of Homer as a great portrait gallery of Stoic worthies, an ensample of ἡθοποιία.

I have dealt with these ideas and discussed these Horatian lines so fully in Chapter 1 of my book on *Lucilius and Horace*, entitled "The Classical Theory of Imitation," that I shall not retrace that ground here.¹ One might have expected that this problem of *imitatio* would rather have been brought up in connection with the discussion of the rubric *τεχνίτης-artifex*, and in point of fact Horace² also discusses *imitatio* under this rubric in lines 310-311 in connection with the discovery of material in the *Socraticae chartae*, but it was not uncommon to transfer this topic of *imitatio* to the rubric *de arte*, and treat it in connection with *elocutio*.³

We have scattering indications in Cicero's *Orator* that he shared this theory of imitation. Thus in *Orator* 5, Cicero emphasizes the fact that the 'amplitude' of Plato did not prevent Aristotle from writing, nor did the marvellous scientific attainments and richness of conception and expression in Aristotle "snuff out" the studies of others. Cicero in this passage seems, therefore, to adumbrate the theory of generous rivalry with a model. We are not then surprised when, in *Orator* 9, Cicero shows by the analogy of the work of Phidias that the creative artist is notwithstanding the adjective an imitator. His imitative creation copies the eternal patterns or Platonic ideas of perfection and excellence. Such a Platonic model is therefore all-important for the mimetic arts of literature, of painting, of oratory. So in *Orator* 19, the perfect orator is declared to be an ideal never actually realized by any one man in the welter of life, but cognizable by the intellect. In spite of this fact, the individual orator, and not least Cicero, hopes that he will serve as a norm (*Orator* 24). Yet Thucydides, in spite of the praise lavished upon him, never really served as a model (31).

¹ But I should like to call attention to the fact that Horace in *Epist.* 1, 19, which deals with the problem of imitating the Greeks, supplements the doctrines there set forth. Cf. Jensen's article, "Neoptolemos und Horaz" in the *Abhandlungen der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin*, 1918, *philosophisch-historische Klasse*, n. 14, pp. 15 ff. for possible relations with Neoptolemus. Cf. *supra*, p. 4.

² Cf. *infra*, pp. 55 ff.

³ So Quintilian, *Instit. Orat.* 3, 5, 1, and see Barwick, *op. cit.*, *Hermes*, LVII, p. 47.

This principle of imitation is especially operative within the limits of the plain style, which springs so naturally from the daily behavior of life ('*consuetudinem*') that it at once stirs the imitative faculties of a throng of copyists. Yet this is in fact illusion, for the perfection of the plain style, as Cicero and Horace well knew, rests on a long imitative discipline, and a stern technical apprenticeship.¹ Cicero admirably expresses these facts when in 76, speaking of the ideal Attic orator, he declares:

summissus est et humilis, consuetudinem imitans, ab indisertis re plus quam opinione differens. Itaque eum qui audiunt, quamvis ipsi infantes sint, tamen illo modo confidunt se posse dicere; nam orationis subtilitas imitabilis illa quidem videtur esse existimanti, sed nihil est experienti minus.

So Horace in speaking of his own stylistic ideal, *Ars Poetica* 240-243, which is in the main that of the *sermo repens per humum* says:

ex noto fictum carmen sequar, ut sibi quivis
speret idem, sudet multum frustra que laboret
ausus idem: tantum series iuncturaque pollet,
tantum de medio sumptis accedit honoris.

Finally, before leaving the topic of *imitatio*, a word should be said of the imitative relation which makes Homer a model for the tragic poets, so far as the *μῦθος* or *fama* was concerned, as Horace informs us in line 119. He is also a model, as even a superficial analysis of 137-152 reveals: (1) in sustained epic dignity; (2) in a steadily mounting power of exposition; (3) in the perfect unity of his material and in its careful disposition; (4) in the dramatic rapidity of his narration, which realizes the virtue of *συνοπία*; (5) in his power to blend in due proportions illusion and tradition into a unified whole. On these Homeric virtues the aspirants for dramatic honors must depend.

I turn next to Cicero's doctrine of the three styles, a concrete application to the orator's problem of the principle of *πρέπον* or appropriateness.² Cicero treats the *genus tenue* in 76-90, the *genus medium* in 91-96, and the *genus grande* in 100-112. His conclusion is that like Demosthenes the perfect orator must be master of all three styles, and be able to blend them artistically in accordance with the demands of the three *officia* of the orator, *probare*, *delectare*, *flectere*, as set forth

¹ For the latter, cf. Horace *Ars Poetica*, 438-452, and *infra*, pp. 71-72.

² Cf. *supra*, pp. 11-21.

in 69-75. I shall presently consider the *officia oratoris* and the corresponding *officia poetae*. I must now consider the thorny question of how far Horace has given us indications in the *Ars Poetica* of his attitude toward the three styles, and the relation of these three styles to the various *genres*. The question is a difficult one, for Horace has nowhere explicitly discussed the matter in the *Ars Poetica*. Yet his theory of the *officia poetae* as summarily stated in lines 333-334 and again in lines 343-344 is essentially identical with the theory of the *officia oratoris* popularized, but not originated, by Cicero in the *Orator*.

In the development of this theory of the three styles Cicero expounds and illustrates by citation his doctrine that the perfect orator should be master of all three styles. Horace has by no means done anything similar. Nevertheless, there are implicit in his detailed discussion of the dramatic *genres* certain indications which seem to show that his attitude, though with some important modifications, approximated to that of Cicero. Let us not forget, however, that Horace's full discussion of the dramatic *genres* is not prompted, like Cicero's use of the various types of oratory, by any effort to illustrate a thesis. In the first instance Horace was probably led to consider the dramatic *genres* in some detail because from the days of Plato and Aristotle and throughout the Hellenistic period rhetoricians had conducted literary discussions with especial reference to these forms, which almost served as norms. Horace was heir to this long tradition. In the second place Horace's theory of satiric composition as developed in *Satires* 1, 4; 1, 10; and 2, 1, is obviously motivated in considerable degree by such rhetorical canons. Again, though I do not take the *Pisones qua poetae* very seriously, it is still true that these young men were planning an excursion into the field of the drama. Finally, Horace himself was temperamentally sympathetic to the drama. With no desire, therefore, to press the evidence too far, let us see what scattering indications we find in lines 153-294 of the *Ars Poetica* of Horace's attitude toward the plain, the middle, and the grand style.

In my book on *Lucilius and Horace*, and especially in Chapter 2, and in the pages in Chapter 6 dealing with the *Ars Poetica* I tried to show at length that Horace was an adherent to the doctrines of the plain style, and the theory of the liberal jest associated with it.¹ I am

¹ Cf. index under Style, p. 517.

still of that opinion in so far as the theory of the plain style involves adherence to the five stylistic virtues advocated by Diogenes of Babylon, sound Latinity, clearness, brevity, appropriateness, avoidance of the vulgar. So far as Horatian poetry consists of *sermones* (and *epistulae*) it clearly falls under the canon of the plain style, for the sermo *par excellence* is the *genre* in which the plain style realizes its peculiar virtues. Even in the *Odes* we see the influence of similar tendencies.¹ In these matters I shall sing no palinode. Upon re-examination of the evidence, however, I am inclined to doubt whether the 'fundamentalists' of the stripe of Brutus would always have recognized Horace as a member in good standing of the Attic conventicle. In this respect I shall cry *peccavi* and shall enter in extenuation the Horatian plea:

hoc est mediocribus illis
ex vitiis unum.

I am not at all sure that with the lapse of years Horace may not have shifted his own ground, as he certainly did in the matter of philosophy. At any rate, at the time when he wrote the *Ars Poetica* his position in advising literary aspirants, who, it must be remembered, were to write in all probability in some dramatic form,² is distinctly nearer to that of Cicero in the *Orator*. That is, he seems to believe that the perfect poet will be master of every style, and employ as a general practice that style which is normally bracketed with the *genre* with which he is working. At the same time, in accordance with the principles of variety and decorum he will not hesitate to levy upon the other styles as occasion demands.³ If he wrote a satyr drama he would modify the principles which constitute the *lex operis* of the *Sermones*. Even in the *Sermones* themselves we have occasional flights into the epic⁴ designed to secure variety and contrast. These sometimes have a touch of the mock heroic. Sometimes, however, they are brief, but half-serious attempts in the epic *genre*. For example in the sixth Satire of book two, 85-115, the story of the country and the city mouse is a parody of epic with some imitation. In the famous interview with

¹ Cf. *supra*, p. 27.

² See Wickham, introduction to the *Ars Poetica*.

³ See my treatment of *Ars Poetica* lines 1-37 on pp. 16-20 above.

⁴ The whole topic of the satirist's attitude toward Epic from Lucilius to Juvenal demands investigation.

Trebatius Testa (*Satires*, 2, 1, 13-15), we have a foray into the epic field such as Lucilius had made even before Horace. Though Horace approximates the Ciceronian doctrine of the variable employment of the three styles, there nevertheless exists an important distinction between the attitudes of the two men, which is due to their fundamental difference in temperament. As one who had the temper of the poet *raro et pauca loquentis*, Horace never quite conquered his distrust of the grand style. On the other hand, Cicero, the life-long disciple of *copia*, and the adept in swaying the emotions of his audience, has an inveterate predilection for the instruments of the grand style. Where literary convention or the law of the *genre* permitted a free choice — and this was less frequent than we moderns realize — Horace's preference would be for winning the hearts of his audience by the subtle devices of ἥθος,¹ Cicero's by the more passionate appeals summarized under πάθος. Let us now analyze the matter in somewhat greater detail, considering first the grand style, second, the plain style, and third the middle style, and comparing under each rubric the evidence of the *Ars Poetica* and of the *Orator*.

We have already seen in the *Ars Poetica* 95-98² that tragedy to produce a pathetic rather than a strictly tragic effect descends to the level of the *sermo pedestris*, abandoning bombast and overelaborate compounds. Ordinarily, however, tragedy seeks its passionate emotional effects by the grand style, *Ars Poetica* 120-124. Yet the grand style, whether expressing itself in tragedy or in epic, stands in danger at times of falling into bathos (137-139):

'fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum.'
quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatus?
parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.

Cicero himself (*Orator* 98) clearly recognizes this danger, inseparable from the grand style, when he refuses to permit his perfect orator to employ it exclusively and emphasizes the possibility of a fall:

sed multum interest inter hoc dicendi genus et superiora. qui in illo subtili et acuto elaboravit, ut callide arguteque diceret nec quidquam altius cogi-

¹ Cf. the famous characterization of Horace in Persius, *Sat.* 1, 116 f.: *omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico tangit | et admissus circum praecordia ludii.*

² *Supra*, pp. 32 f.

taret, hoc uno perfecto magnus orator est, si non maximus, minimeque in lubrico versabitur et, si semel constiterit, numquam cadet.

On the other hand, the orator of the middle style, as Cicero immediately adds:

non extimescet ancipites dicendi incertosque casus: etiam si quando minus succedet, ut saepe fit, magnum tamen periculum non adibit; alte enim cadere non potest.

Even Cicero in the following section 99¹ of the *Orator* is moved to say of the orator who is master of the grand style alone:

hic autem copiosissimus, si nihil est aliud, vix satis sanus videri solet . . . si non praeparatis auribus inflammare rem coepit, furere² apud sanos et quasi inter sobrios bacchari vinulentus videtur.

Also tragedy and other free creations in the grand style, unless they observe an Homeric discretion, are in danger of seeming untrue to life. Horace twice voices this criticism, in lines 187-188 and in lines 338-340.³

There is abundant evidence in the *Ars Poetica* that Horace still holds to the puristic virtues of the plain style. He asserts the importance of brevity in 25, and very emphatically in 335;⁴ of clearness (25 and 40). The doctrine of *Latinitas* pervades the whole discussion of the ἐκλογή ὀνομάτων (45-72). The doctrine of decorum is the thread on which most of the reflections of the satire are strung. The doctrine of κατασκευή, or artistic finish, based on the theory of relentless revision, has nowhere received more emphatic approval than in the *Ars Poetica*, especially in lines 438-452, where Horace discusses the part *emendatio* plays in the functions of the poet.⁵ The wit appropriate for the plain style and its modification for the middle style are discussed in connection with the satyr drama, *Ars Poetica* 220-239.⁶

The general descriptive epithets of the plain style are frequently used by Horace, and correspond closely to those found in Cicero's description of the plain style in the *Orator* 76-90. The plain style,

¹ Cf. also *Brutus*, 233.

² *Infra*, pp. 72-74, on the *demens poeta*. For more orthodox passages on the grand style, cf. Cicero *Orator* 20, 30, 97, 100, 102.

³ On these lines, *infra*, p. 64.

⁴ Cf. also *Serm.* 1, 10, 9.

⁵ On *emendatio*, *infra*, pp. 67-70.

⁶ See *infra*, pp. 44-45.

according to Cicero, is: *summissus, humilis, subtilis, solutus sed non vagus, liberior conglutinatione verborum, purus, dilucidus, planus, verecundus, simplex in propriis usitatisque verbis, tenuis, elegans, parvus*.¹ So Horace in the *Ars Poetica* describes it as *humilis, humi tutus, callida iunctura, lucidus, parvus, tenuis, cautus (in verbis serendis)*.²

Miss Grant in her unpublished thesis on *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable* has shown in a very striking manner how close is the relation of the Ciceronian theory of the laughable, as set forth in the *De Oratore*, 2, 54, 217-271, 290, and in abbreviated form in the *Orator* 87, to Horace's theories. She has there given a detailed discussion of the meanings of such technical terms as *facetis, ridiculus, dicax, scurrilis, sal, urbanus*, and others which are common to Cicero and Horace, and many of which appear in the *Ars Poetica*. It is of the utmost importance to observe that Cicero (*Orator* 87-90) includes his discussion on wit and humor under the sections on the plain style, where, as we have seen,³ it properly belongs, in accordance with the theory of relaxed tension. Cicero clearly holds, with some minor modifications, the same theory as Horace as to the strict limitation set by ethics and aesthetics upon the employment of the liberal jest.

The middle style, as distinguished from the plain style (Cicero *Orator* 91-96), has for its outstanding characteristic ἡδύτης (*suavitas*). It is really a transitional state of somewhat unstable equilibrium lying between the extremes of the grand style and the plain style, and borrowing heavily from both of its competitors. It is fuller and more copious than the plain style, makes freer use of metaphorical language and ornamentation, and has a smooth and even flow. It is highly polished (*expolitus*), graceful (*lepidus*), and charming (*venustus*). It is *pinguis* and *floridus*.

Horace, whose style is best summarized in the famous *oxymoron* of Petronius by the words *curiosa felicitas*, is especially insistent in the *Ars Poetica* upon the qualities of smooth finish and flowing transition which mark the neutral zone in which the plain style and the middle

¹ Adjectives found or formed on close analogy to descriptive phrases in Cicero's *Orator*, 76-90.

² See Lane Cooper, *Concordance to Horace*. It would be easy to extend the list by citation from the adjectives used in a technical rhetorical sense in the critical satires of Horace.

³ *Supra*, pp. 34-36.

style merge. Thus he twice speaks of *iunctura*, in 48 and in 242. In the first passage, speaking of the choice of words, he shows how a common word can take color, like a chameleon, from a carefully wrought context:

dixeris egregie, notum si callida verbum
reddiderit iunctura novum.

In 242, he declares:

tantum series iuncturaque pollet.

In this latter passage Horace is evidently thinking of the σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων. The passage strikingly resembles that of Philodemus *V. H.* 2, 4, 151: ποίημα . . . γενέσθαι ἐξ ἰδιωτικῶν τε καὶ εὐτελῶν (λέξεων), συγκειμένων δὲ καλῶς, χρηστόν.¹ Similarly Cicero in the *Orator* 162 declares: *verba legenda sunt potissimum bene sonantia, sed ea non ut poetae exquisita ad sonum, sed sumpta de medio*. Again in lines 291-294 Horace insists on a finish of such smooth texture that the critical nail will glide over it as though over the perfectly smooth surface of marble blocks meticulously placed. In line 26, he had already spoken of *levitas* as a desirable quality. In line 99 he strongly emphasized *dulcedo*, the typical virtue of the middle style:

non satis est pulchra esse poemata: dulcia sunt.

Horace regards the satyr drama as *par excellence* the *genre* bound by a close working allegiance both in its diction and in its humor to the refined ideals of the middle style. In diction this style will not be couched in the humble style of the *tabernae*, nor yet, as it rises from the level reaches (*humum*) of the plain style, will it seek to attain a cloudy void of meaningless diction (*Ars Poetica*, 230). Therefore Horace will have his satyrs use language not unadorned with the colors of rhetoric or with the figures approved by the middle style. He will not confine his diction to *dominantia* (= κύρια) *verba*, that is to words used in their literal rather than in their metaphorical sense (234-235). His delineation of character will differ from that of scenes of Lucilian² satire, modelled on the New Comedy. The language of his fauns will

¹ Hausrath J. J. *Suppl.* XVII, 275.

² I accept the reading *Lucilium*, the real reading of the MSS. and of the Scholia of the Pseudo-Acro.

not be obscene, *immundus et ignominiosus* (247). Youth will not quite have its day in too tender lines:

aut nimium teneris iuvenentur versibus umquam.

In fact in these lines it is almost impossible to recognize the Horace of such earlier satires of the first book as 2, 7, and 8.

In short, Horace's whole stylistic attitude in the minute description of a genre virtually unknown on Italian soil¹ is in my judgment primarily determined by the influence of Greek rhetorical discussions of the satyr drama.

In the matter of the humor appropriate for this middle *genre* of the satyr drama Horace seems to share the touch of reprobation with which Cicero (*Orator* 89) thinks of the pointed and barbed *bon mots* of the *dicax* as contrasted with the more quiet, pervasive, and artistic humor of the *facetus*. So Horace in lines 225 f. will seek to commend his saucy satyrs by assigning to them the less boisterous humor of the *σπουδαιογέλοιος* who mingles truth with playful jest (*seria ludo*):

verum ita risores, ita commendare dicacis
conveniet satyros, ita vertere seria ludo.

And in general, in the matter of humor, the restrained Horace is less catholic than the exuberant Cicero. Cicero, two years after the publication of the *Orator*, expressed in the *De Officiis* 1, 104, his hearty approval of the rollicking humor of Plautus. Horace, however, in lines 270-275 of the *Ars Poetica*, expressed his opinion that the preceding generations had extended too great an indulgence both to the wit and to the metrical exuberance of Plautus. The Horatian canon of humor demands more charm or grace, not to say urbanity (cf. 273). In fact, the whole passage on the satyr drama accords fairly well with the *dicta* of the *Auctor ad Herennium* on the middle style.²

The transition from the consideration of the poetic art (*De Arte Poetica*) to the consideration of the true or perfect poet, the *artifex*, is made in lines 295-305 of the *Ars Poetica*. In lines 285-291 Horace had concluded his analysis of the Greek dramatic *genres* by comparing the dramatic efforts of the Romans, the *praetextata* and the *togata*.

¹ One must perhaps recognize the possibility of some traces of the influence of the Roman conception of *satura* or of the *Fabula Atellana* in the account.

² 4, 8, 11; 4, 9, 13.

Roman dramatic genius, he holds, had been too indifferent to the claims of artistic perfection, the *limae labor et mora* (i.e. *ποίησις*, as it is called in the Philodemus papyri). He therefore (291-294) seeks to impress on the *Pisones* the importance of revision (*emendatio*).¹

Yet most men, following a perversion of the *dictum* of Democritus, count natural talent as a divine gift which makes our poet a "*Fortunatus*,"² and art but a poor thing. Consequently they believe that Democritus in excluding the *sani poetae* from Helicon reprobated that labor which seeks perfection, and applied the noble designation of poet, *nomen poetae*, rather to the possessor of poetic madness (i.e. *μανία* or the Dionysiac *ἐνθουσιασμός*).³ With the phrase *nomen poetae*, as Norden has seen,⁴ Horace makes the transition to the personal qualities of his ideal poet. Rhetorical theory uses almost the identical terminology in speaking of the personality of the ideal orator.⁵

Then follows, in lines 304-308, Horace's *propositio* for the rubric *De Poeta*, which in this case also contains his *partitio*, as follows:

ergo fungar vice cotis, acutum
reddere quae ferrum valet, exsors ipsa secandi:
munus et officium, nil scribens ipse, docebo,
unde parentur opes, quid alat formetque poetam,
quid deceat, quid non, quo virtus, quo ferat error.

Let us turn to the analysis and to the consideration of the rhetorical environment of this passage in some detail. It will repay study. We may subdivide this *partitio* as follows: Ia *Munus* of the poet, 309-332; Ib *Officium* of the poet, 333-346; IIa *Opes* of the poet, 310-311, IIb *Quid alat formetque poetam*, 312-317; IIIa *Quid deceat*, 317-324; IIIb *Quid non deceat*, 325-332; IVa *Quo virtus ferat*, 333-452; IVb *Quo ferat error*, 453-476.

¹ Incidentally one must remember that revision is a virtue particularly advocated by the later adherents of the plain style and the Roman Atticists. Cf. Horace's criticisms on Lucilius in *Serm.* 1, 4, and 1, 10, *passim*; also Cicero *Orator* 76, on the difficulty, primarily because of the difficulty of *emendatio*, of attaining mastery in the plain style.

² Of course I here use *fortunatus* capitalized as a transferred epithet.

³ On the *μανία* of the poet compare Clement *Strom.* 6, 168, *frag.* 21; also Dio Chrysostom 53, 1, *frag.* 21; Plato *Phaedrus* 245a; Cicero *De Divinatione* 1, 37, 80. These references are from Heinze-Kiessling⁴ on line 295. See also *infra*, pp. 72-end.

⁴ Norden, *op. cit.*, *Hermes*, XL, pp. 497-498.

⁵ Cicero *Orator* 22; *De Oratore* 1, 15, 64; Quintilian 12, 1, 24.

In this analysis I follow the broad outlines of the analysis of Norden,¹ but in some respects, my analysis is somewhat more minute. In particular I believe that Horace in line 306 is first making a general *propositio* in which he differentiates the *munus poetae* from the *officium poetae*. He then subdivides this *propositio* more narrowly in lines 307 and 308. We ought therefore to find something analogous to the *τόπος de munere poetae*, and something analogous to the *τόπος de officio poetae* in this last part of the *Ars Poetica*. I should prefer, therefore, to rechristen the somewhat misleading designation of Norden,² who entitles lines 309-332 *de instrumentis poetae*, and call these lines *de munere poetae*. Naturally the poet performs his *munus* by means of certain *instrumenta*, but the performance itself, not the *instrumenta*, is the essential thing.

This *τόπος de munere poetae* may in my opinion be more clearly subdivided. Thus lines 310 and 311 clearly answer the question *inventio* (*unde parentur opes*) from the point of view not of the *ars*,³ but rather from that of the *munus poetae*. The question *quid alat formetque poetam* is, I think, answered with equal definiteness in lines 312-317: the poet is formed and nurtured in the midst of the 'daily round, the common task' of Roman life itself. The *quo modo* of these lines is summarized by the categorical future *iubebo* of line 317:

respicere exemplar vitae morumque iubebo.

But it is not enough to be merely an *imitator vitae*. One must be, as line 318 insists, harking back to the *Socraticae chartae* of 310, a *doctus imitator vitae*.⁴ Stylistic perfection, it will be noted, flows both from the study of philosophy (*verbaque provisam rem non invita sequentur*), and from the contact with life itself (*et vivas hinc ducere voces*). The perfect poet must be equally at home with books and with men.

Horace next turns to the question of the *munus* of the poet from the

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 497 ff.; cf. also pp. 487 ff.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 498-501.

³ Cf. *supra*, pp. 21-22. Therefore the *iudicium* implied in *Ars Poetica* 38-41 and in Cicero's *Orator* 44 is quite different (*pace* Norden!) from the philosophic wisdom demanded of the poet and derived from the study of Greek philosophy.

⁴ On the addition of the epithet *doctus* to the critic see *Brutus* 141, 184, 198, 283, 320; *Orator* 13. For the part the *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν* and the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκαστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα* play in these lines, see *infra*, pp. 48-49, 52-55.

point of view of stylistic perfection, 319-322. If one must set in one camp occasional passages of polished perfection and an *ἦθος* based on life itself, and in the other the charm of rhythm and sound, Horace will remain in the Roman camp. And is he not right, judged from the ultimate norm of a Sophocles, a Virgil, a Dante? He denies, however, lines 323-324, that Greece made any such distinction between native talent and perfection of finish.

On the other hand, the hard and practical education of the Romans (lines 325-331) knows nothing of the decorum of philosophy, or rightly considered, the decorum of life. If a good poet must first be a good man, as the Stoics taught,¹ how can a good poet be born in the atmosphere of avarice? The Greeks were *avari laudis*; the Roman is *avarus peculi*. He is a slave, not a free man.

I trust that this analysis has shown that lines 317-324 picture for us the environment suited to the poet, and lines 325-332 the environment in which poetic genius must wither. They consider *πρέπον* from the point of view of the actualities of life.

In lines 333-346 Horace turns to the *officium poetae*. It is quite true that this conception is also closely related to the *τόπος περὶ τοῦ πρέποντος*, as Norden has pointed out.² Yet it seems to me better to regard *πρέπον* as a quality suffusing the description of the *officium poetae*. Thus lines 333-334 define the *officium poetae* in terms intimately related to Cicero's definition of the *officium oratoris* in the *Orator* 69-70. Towards the end of 70 Cicero passes on to the consideration of *πρέπον* and continues his analysis in 71-74. So Horace, after briefly defining the *officium poetae* in these two famous lines:

aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae
aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae,

goes on to show in lines 335-337 that brevity is the great virtue by which teaching (*docere* or *prodesse*) attains its goal. So verisimilitude is the instrument which has pleasure as its *officium* (lines 338-340).

We shall see that the poet who truly apprehends his *munus* will combine the *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν* looking toward a conception of life unified by philosophy with the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκαστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα* which inheres in the active participation in all the infinitely varied

¹ Cf. Heinze-Kiessling,⁴ comment on line 332.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 501.

functions of life, and in performing the appropriate *officia* to all members of the humanly organized state or *κόσμος*, the copy in miniature of the creator's *mundus* or universe. So the poet who perfectly understands his *officium* will combine the *officium* of teaching, the *utile*, with the *officium* of delighting, the *dulce*. He will thus gain a fame at once international and immortal, 340-345.

But is there really any such thing as the perfect *sapiens* or the perfect poet? After all, the perfect poet is a Platonic ideal brought down from the austere heights of philosophy to the shifting lights and shadows of rhetoric and of poetics. Horace, therefore, turns in lines 347-452 to the definition in terms of actuality of his perfect poet. As Norden has correctly seen, these lines answer the question *quo ferat virtus*, just as lines 453-476 answer the question *quo ferat error*. Hence we may properly describe lines 347-452 as *de perfecto poeta*, and lines 453-476 as *de insano poeta*. Both sections are strongly influenced by the schematization of the *τέχνη ῥητορική*, as well as by Cicero's partially derivative treatment of such themes. At the same time both recognize differences between the ideal poet and the ideal, and the mad poet and the dimly adumbrated figure of the mad orator. The *mediocris orator* is a well defined and even useful individual. The *mediocris poeta*, however, is unendurable. On the other hand the type of the *demens poeta* is well known, and is derived in fact from the phantasmagoric illusion that the variety of the world of phenomena may not be synthesized into a higher unity. It has remained for modern romanticism to give apotheosis to this type, as Peacock's mordant satire of *Nightmare Abbey* reveals.

Accordingly the *τόπος de perfecto poeta*, 347-452, is subdivided into two sections, one negative, the other positive. The negative subdivision extends from 347 to 407. It is in turn subdivided into (a) lines 347-365, which assert that complete faultlessness is unattainable; (b) 366-390, that mediocrity condemns the poet (though not the orator), and that the poet must invoke self-criticism as well as the criticism of others; (c) 391-407, the praise of poetry. This divine origin and civilizing mission of poetry is the sanction for all the plodding efforts of those whom one, paraphrasing the convenient phrase of Seneca, is tempted to call the *poetae proficientes*, or poetical progressives. One certainly feels the Stoic atmosphere in this portion of the

Ars Poetica. These progressives are not disobedient to this heavenly vision of the poet's mission, admirably conceived and executed by Horace with the high enthusiasm of the grand style.¹

The second subdivision, lines 408-452, returns to the didactic tone of the plain style and points out the steep way, which, as in the Pythagorean Ψ ,² rises to the right, along which our perfect poet must slowly mount to the heights of perfection. Just as Horace shows, 343-344, that the poet who rightly apprehended his *officium* must combine the *utile* and the *dulce*, and aim both to teach and to delight; so in lines 405-411, following a rhetorical commonplace, he shows that the perfect poet, as I have elsewhere said, must first be born and then be made, by submitting gladly to an exacting discipline, both scholarly and technical.³ Genius must sit in the schoolroom of the philosopher and rhetorician alike, and bite its nails to the quick. Virtue consists in recognizing the trinitarian doctrine which believes in the perfect blending of φύσις (*natura* or *ingenium*), of μελέτη (*emendatio* or *exercitatio*), and of ἐπιστήμη (*studium*). This is Horatian orthodoxy. On the other hand error consists in following the unitarian doctrine of *ingenium*. That way lies madness. And madness is damned not by the punishment of the pit, but by that of the 'well.' The parallelism is as instructive as it is amusing. The concluding lines of the *Ars Poetica* sketch in the tone of the σπουδαιογέλοιος the inimitable picture of the *insanus poeta* (453-476).⁴

My next task is to consider the interrelations between these contrasted types, the *perfectus* and the *demens poeta* and the counter types of the *perfectus*, the *mediocris*, and the *malus orator* of Cicero's *Orator* (and the rhetorical tradition).⁵

¹ Albeit, a well-worn poetical and rhetorical commonplace. See *infra*, pp. 65-67.

² See Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, New Haven, 1922, p. 150.

³ *Lucilius and Horace*, p. 30. On Φύσις, Μελέτη, and Ἐπιστήμη see Shorey *op. cit.* (see *supra*, p. 7).

⁴ We must not forget that the *Ars Poetica* is an εἰσαγωγή thrown into the epistolary form. It is neither epistle nor εἰσαγωγή alone, but both at once.

⁵ As in the preceding section *de arte* I shall depend especially on the Heinze-Kiessling commentary on the *Ars Poetica*, on the commentaries of Sandys and Kroll on the *Orator*, and on the studies of Norden, Kroll, Jensen, and Barwick on the *Ars Poetica*, all frequently cited above.

In lines 304-307, Horace, not without a touch of irony, assumes the rôle of the critic teacher rather than that of the creative artist.

Ergo fungar vice cotis,¹ acutum
reddere quae ferrum valet, exsors ipsa secandi;
munus et officium, nil scribens ipse, docebo.

Such an attitude is a rhetorical commonplace, re-enforced, to be sure, by the real disinclination of the practical Roman to arrogate to himself theoretical knowledge. So in the *Orator* 43, at the beginning of the *tractatio*, Cicero is obviously following the same tradition:

quoniam tria videnda sunt oratori: quid dicat et quo quidque loco et quo modo, dicendum omnino est quid sit optimum in singulis, sed aliquanto secus atque in tradenda arte dici solet. nulla praecepta ponemus — neque enim id suscepimus — sed excellentis eloquentiae speciem et formam adumbrabimus; nec quibus rebus ea paretur, exponemus, sed qualis nobis esse videatur.

One notices here the linguistic parallelism between Cicero's *in tradenda arte*² and Horace's *nil scribens*; between Cicero's *ea quibus rebus paretur* and Horace's very brief exposition of *inventio* (*unde parentur opes*) in lines 309-311. Notice that though Cicero will sketch the ideal type of eloquence: *excellentis eloquentiae speciem et formam adumbrabimus* . . . he does not neglect the figure of the perfect orator. So Horace will mould the outlines of the perfect poet (*quid alat formetque poetam*).³ Both deprecate a professional attitude. Again in the *Orator* 112 where Cicero discusses the training of his perfect orator, he affects to speak with critical taste rather than with professional knowledge. He is an *existimator*,⁴ not a *magister*.

In the *Orator* 117, in the midst of his discussion of the training of the perfect orator, Cicero reiterates for the third time his insistence on this point of view:

erit igitur haec facultas in eo quem volumus esse eloquentem, ut definire rem possit neque id faciat tam presse et anguste, quam in illis eruditissimis disputationibus fieri solet, sed cum explanatius tum etiam uberius, et ad commune iudicium popularemque intelligentiam adcommodatius; idemque

¹ For the metaphor of the whetstone cf. Plutarch *Orat. Vitae* 838 E; Shorey *op. cit.*, p. 188 note 4.

² In the *De Inventione* and the *De Partitione Oratoria* Cicero does follow the traditional rules of the textbooks.

³ Notice *formam* and *formet*.

⁴ Cf. *Brutus* 92.

etiam, cum res postulabit, genus universum in species certas, ut nulla neque praetermittatur neque redundet, partiatur ac dividet. quando autem aut quo modo id faciat, nihil ad hoc tempus, quoniam, ut supra dixi, iudicem esse me, non doctorem volo.

In this passage of Cicero, I am half inclined to suggest that there is again implicit the antithesis between the *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν* and the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκάστον πρόσωπον καὶ πράγμα*. At any rate, the passage reads like a rubric for the argumentative sequence which Horace follows in lines 309-318. To Cicero's *genus universum*, the philosophical universal, corresponds Horace's injunction, given with the categorical brevity of a Stoic or Academic rhetorical manual, and enjoining, lines 309-311, the study of philosophy.¹ But Horace is not content to stop there; he supplements his *genus universum* by dividing it into the 'species certas' of human life with its ever shifting duties and phenomena (312-317); that is, he presents his thesis also *sub specie humanitatis* according to that aspect of *πρέπον* which faces variety. His presentation is thus adapted, as Cicero would say, *ad commune iudicium popularemque intellegentiam*. He is at once learned, *doctus*, and alive, *vivus*. In fact in lines 319-322, which immediately follow, we see a direct appeal to the popular standard of judgment, which if not learned is at least sound in preferring linguistic and ethical virtues to that of a mere euphonic vocalism.²

That we are dealing with a rhetorical commonplace in the lines in which Horace assumes the attitude of the non-dogmatic critic is proved by other similar passages in Cicero's *De Oratore* in which the speaker assumes the identical attitude of the authoritative, but non-professional critic.³ Yet differences also must be noted. Cicero, more coura-

¹ With Horace's *Socraticae chartae* compare Cicero's: *in illis eruditissimis disputationibus*.

² Later, in 386, Horace again asserts the importance of the popular judgment by advising Piso to submit his compositions to the criticisms of Spurius Maecius Tarpa, whom, in view of the slighting allusion in *Serm.* 1, 10, 38, he can hardly have regarded as an accomplished critic, but who rather gives voice to the popular judgment.

³ E.g.: *De Oratore* 1, 1; 24, 111; 29, 132; 46, 203; 48, 208. Of these passages the resemblance between *De Oratore* 1, 46, 203 with Horace is rather striking. Horace in line 309 speaks of the *principium et fons: scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons*. So Cicero makes Crassus deny that he is an actual *dux* or guide,

geous than Horace, asserts his intention regardless of social consequences to his standing as a Roman senator to enter upon the semi-technical discussion of the rules of the rhetorical schools bearing on the σύνθεσις ὀνομάτων and prose rhythm. The result is one of our most valuable repositories for the whole theory of rhythmic prose.

So far, as the result of the comparative analysis of several sections of Cicero's *Orator* and of Horace's lines 304-306 in the *Ars Poetica*, we have seen that both writers assume the rôle of the cultivated critic in close touch with his audience and with life, rather than that of the professional teacher. Let us now turn to the brief announcement of Horace's next topic of the *partitio*, contained in the first part of line 307: *Unde parentur opes*,¹ and its almost equally brief discussion in lines 309-311.

Here too we shall see clear evidence both (1) that Cicero in the *Orator* and Horace in these lines have an identical point of view;² (2) that this common point of view is derived from Graeco-Roman rhetorical and poetical theory.

In 309 Horace declares that the primal cause and font of correct writing (*recte scribendi* = the Greek ὀρθογραφία) is wisdom, that is, philosophy:

scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons.³

he is rather one who with his finger has pointed out the road that leads to the fountain (*fons*). The similarity is striking and as in Horace follows the allusion to the *Socraticae chartae*, so in Cicero (204) follows the allusion to the services of Socrates. Somewhat similar is the affected modesty of oratorical or poetical *prooemia*. See Cicero *Orator* I, 1 and the secondary *prooemium* 140-148 *passim*. On epic *prooemia* see Lucretius I, 136 ff. and Engel: *De antiquorum epicorum . . . prooemiis*, Marburg, 1910, not accessible to me.

¹ Cf. Barwick, *op. cit.*, p. 50 in *Hermes* LVII, p. 50. Barwick wrongly fuses the whole of the line. But Horace clearly makes a strong sense pause, coincident with the caesura, after *opes*. Line 308 shows a parallel subdivision of metrical and sense pauses. I shall therefore assume that Horace fulfilled the promise indicated by *unde parentur opes* in lines 309-311; the promise indicated by *quid alai formatque poeta* in lines 311-332. The above subsections taken together expound the *munus poetae*.

² *Infra*, pp. 54-55.

³ *Principium et fons* are of course a translation of Greek rhetorical terminology. See Strabo I, p. 18: πηγὴ καὶ ἀρχὴ φράσεως κατεσκευασμένης, καὶ ῥητορικῆς ὑπὴρξεν ἢ ποιητικῆς. The two terms combine the notions of ἀρχή and αἴτιον.

In these lines *sapere* clearly refers to a cultivated knowledge of philosophy,¹ for Horace goes on to insist that in philosophy is to be found the educational armory where man is fitted for the battle of life, described in 312-317. As I have already pointed out,² the *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν* precedes the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκάστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα*. From philosophy the poet will derive his subject matter (*res*).

Cicero is even more insistent on a broad training in philosophy, law, and history for his ideal orator. He devotes 113-120 to a detailed defence of such a training, following a discussion on the *officium oratoris* 69-75, which, guided by the principle of *πρέπον*, leads to the discussion 76-99, of the three *genera dicendi*. The perfect orator should be master of all three styles, 100-112. There follows, 113-120, the argument for liberal studies as against a purely vocational education. The debate is age-old. Horace, however, reversing the sequence of the argument, starts out with an assertion, 309-311, of the necessity of philosophic training before he sets forth the *officium poetae*, 333-334.³

In 70 of the *Orator*, Cicero had already declared, after his enumeration of the *officia oratoris*, the necessity for philosophy which, as in Horace, is intimately associated with the doctrine of *πρέπον* or decorum:⁴ *sed est eloquentiae sicut reliquiarum rerum fundamentum sapientia ut enim in vita sic in oratione nihil est difficilius quam quid deceat videre*. So in Horace after the insistence on a knowledge of philosophy we immediately pass to the discussion of the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκάστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα*, 312-317. Still earlier in the proem of the *Orator* (4), Cicero ranged broad training in the liberal arts, *ἐπιστήμη*, side by side with natural gifts.

In the concluding chapters of the proem of the *Orator*, 11-19,⁵ Cicero argues that the perfect orator is unthinkable without philo-

¹ Heinze-Kiessling⁴ is wrong in giving a generalized meaning to *sapere*.

² *Supra*, pp. 12 ff.

³ Limitations of space make it impossible to traverse even in summary the much more detailed argument for the general training of the orator which in the *De Oratore* Cicero puts into the mouth of Crassus. Compare *De Oratore* 1, 12, 53 for a convenient summary of this argument.

⁴ Cf. *supra*, pp. 12 f. and Quintilian 12, 2, 6, which affords corroboration of the interpretation of the Ciceronian passage, which I have given.

⁵ I follow the admirable digest of the argument given in the introduction to Kroll's edition of the *Orator*.

sophic education. He summarizes his detailed exposition on this matter in the third book of the *De Oratore*, chapters 122 ff., in order to show that the perfect orator can rise only from the Academic school.¹ The whole argumentative sequence of the *Orator* should be read. I shall quote only 12, which in essence is identical with Horace's more compressed statement (310-312): *et fateor me oratorem, si modo sim, aut etiam quicumque sim, non ex rhetorum officinis sed ex Academiae spatiis exstitisse: illa enim sunt curricula multiplicium variorumque sermonum, in quibus Platonis primum sunt impressa vestigia*. And at the beginning of 14: *positum sit igitur in primis, quod post magis intellegetur, sine philosophia non posse quem quaerimus eloquentem*. So in 15, Cicero quotes Plato's *Phaedrus* (269 E) where Socrates declares that the oratorical primacy of Pericles was due to his having heard the lectures of Anaxagoras.² In 16 Cicero ventures to assert that all three branches of philosophy, Dialectic, Ethics, and Physics, were indispensable to the philosopher.

Cicero in 113-120 keeps his promise of returning to a detailed discussion of the relation between eloquence and a liberal training. In 113-118 he asserts the importance of a thorough knowledge of dialectic. In 118 he lays stress on the knowledge of the philosophical commonplaces (of ethics?). Finally in 119 he asserts the importance of the orator's command of his subject matter: *de materia loquor orationis etiam nunc, non de ipso genere dicendi; volo enim prius habeat orator rem, de qua dicat, dignam auribus eruditis quam cogitet quibus verbis quidque dicat [aut quomodo]*.

Let me now quote the well known lines 310-311 of the *Ars Poetica* which form a perfect summary of the more copious rhetorical argument of Cicero, and which are obviously derived from similar rhetorical sources:

rem tibi Socraticae poterunt ostendere chartae,
verbaque provisam rem non invita sequentur.

¹ Cf. *Brutus* 120.

² For the propagation of such doctrines by Hermippus and Antiochus, see Kroll's notes on 15. But probably Panaetius, an ardent Platonist, was quite as important in giving currency to such views in the Scipionic circle. Compare my *Lucilius and Horace*, index s.v. *Panaetius*, p. 513. Notice that in fragment 709 (Marx) even before Horace Lucilius used the phrase *Socratici charti*. Compare especially my discussion on p. 462.

It is clear that the *Socraticae chartae* are primarily the *spatia Academiae* of Cicero 12.¹ Knowledge of philosophy will lend eloquence to both poet and orator. It is also true that line 311 is a paraphrase of Cato's aphorism *rem tene verba sequuntur*.²

We have already seen ³ that Cicero and Horace alike seem to make the same rhetorical distinction between the *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν* and the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκάστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα* which is found in Philodemus,⁴ and have noticed that even before Philodemus the rhetorical commonplace on the *officia vitae* was formulated by Xenophon in the *Memorabilia*.⁵ This type of decorum looks toward the variety of the world of phenomena, and may therefore properly be described as the decorum of life. In the *De Oratore* 1, 12, 53, already quoted,⁶ Cicero seems to have this type of propriety in mind. This ever varying decorum is that which the poet, who, like the writer of the New Comedy,⁷ must hold the mirror up to the *Comédie Humaine*, is peculiarly concerned. Hence we find Cicero in the *De Officiis* 1, 97, a book which was written under the special influence of Panaetius, analyzing this decorum as the decorum of the poets and saying: *quocirca poetae in magna varietate personarum etiam vitiosis quid conveniat et quid deceat videbunt*. So Horace asserts of him who knows many-faceted life by personal experience (315-316):

ille profecto
reddere personae scit convenientia cuique.

In my *Lucilius and Horace* ⁸ I have already pointed out that these lines of the *Ars Poetica* (311-317) contain a formulation of the commonplace on the *vir bonus* and a definition of *virtus* conceived in terms

¹ Cf. Quintilian *Instit. Orat.*, 12, 1, 25.

² For variant forms of the same Greek aphorism, cf. Xenophon *Memorabilia* 4, 6, 1; Cicero *De Oratore* 1, 12, 51; 14, 63; 2, 34, 146; 3, 31, 124 (*rerum enim copia verborum copiam gignit*); 3, 50, 194; *Brutus* 23.

³ *Supra*, pp. 12-14.

⁴ Gomperz, *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, CXXIII, 6, p. 12 (see above p. 13, note 1).

⁵ *Supra*, p. 13, note 3.

⁶ *Supra*, p. 15, note 2.

⁷ Lucilius 1029 (Marx).

⁸ P. 465. Cf. also Cichorius *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius*, p. 349 ff., and Marx, *Lucilius, comment. ad* 1326 ff.

of *officia* or social services, a formulation probably derived from the teachings of Panaetius and strikingly similar to the famous fragment of Lucilius 1326 ff. on virtue.

In these lines, then, as well as in lines 318-322¹ below, Horace skirts the principle of Stoic rhetoric and poetics that the good orator (poet) must be the good man, that is the man who has fulfilled all the *officia* of life. Compare the formulation of that doctrine by Strabo 1, p. 17: οὐχ οἷόν τε ἀγαθὸν γενέσθαι ποιητὴν μὴ πρότερον γενηθέντα ἄνδρα ἀγαθόν: and the parallel definition of the good orator, attributed to Cato, but really derived from the Stoic rhetoric, as the *vir bonus dicendi peritus*.² But how can we hope for a great poet in the Roman environment (*Ars Poetica* 324-332), unfertilized by Greek philosophy?

These lines (309-322), as Heinze-Kiessling intuitively felt, though these learned commentators have not noticed that the rhetoricized Platonic antinomy between the *πρέπον κατὰ σοφίαν* and the *πρέπον καθ' ἕκαστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα*, harks back to the Platonic theory of ideas. The note on line 317, too long to quote here, should be consulted by all my readers. It is with reference to this Platonic pattern, the *exemplar vitae* (317), that the poet will give his shadow-picture, so to say, of this human life. The poet's procedure in these lines is precisely analogous to that of Phidias as described by Cicero *Orator* 9-10, from which context I shall quote a single sentence: *ut igitur in formis et figuris est aliquid perfectum et excellens, cuius ad cogitatam speciem imitando referuntur ea quae sub oculos ipsa non cadunt, sic perfectae eloquentiae speciem animo videmus, effigiem auribus quaerimus*. Neither Horace nor Cicero would have his artist 'disobedient to the heavenly vision' of ideal perfection which resides in the intelligence.

In lines 312-317 Horace emphatically asserted that the poet must "see life steadily and see it whole." Only thus is it possible for him *profecto reddere personae convenientia cuique*. This again is a Platonic conception clearly formulated in the *Republic* 10, 598 E:³ ἀνάγκη γὰρ τὸν ἀγαθὸν ποιητὴν, εἰ μέλλει περὶ ὧν ἂν ποιῇ καλῶς ποιήσῃ, εἰδὸτα ἅρα

¹ See Heinze-Kiessling,⁴ comment on line 322.

² Norden, *op. cit.* in *Hermes*, XL, p. 500, and Radermacher, *Rheinisches Museum*, LIV (1899), p. 284 ff., LVI, p. 314.

³ I follow Barwick, *op. cit.*, *Hermes*, LVII, pp. 55 ff.

ποιεῖν, ἢ μὴ οἶόν τε εἶναι ποιεῖν.¹ Now as Kroll² has seen, we have three opposed theories as to the goal of poetry, which reached Horace through the mediation of Hellenistic rhetoric. The Peripatos and notably Theophrastus set the aim of poetry in the appeal to the emotions (*ψυχαγωγία*); the Stoa set it in moral profit. I should be inclined to add that certain of the later adherents of Epicurus found the aim of poetry in the beautiful succession of melodious sounds. Now Horace in true eclectic fashion is willing to go part way with all three schools. In line 99, he had recognized that poems must be *dulcia*, as well as *pulchra*, a concession which clearly covers as with a blanket a portion of the Epicurean contention. The whole course of this investigation has established his sympathy with the Peripatetic doctrine that poetry is a *λόγος πρὸς τοὺς ἀκροατάς*. Finally in accordance with the growing Stoicism of his later years, he has made increasingly large concessions to the aesthetic theories of the Stoics. We have just discussed his approximation to the Stoic doctrine that the *perfectus poeta* was the *vir bonus scribendi peritus*. As a conscientious artist, also, Horace was by temperament strongly sympathetic with the Stoic insistence on disciplinary values. If no conflict of interest arises, therefore, Horace will live at peace with all the schools. If, however, a conflict is forced, he must take his stand with the Academy and the Stoa rather than with the extremists of the Garden. So far as I can now see, this attitude would tend to place him in opposition to the teachings of Philodemus at the time he wrote the *Ars Poetica*, no matter how much more favorably he may have been inclined to the Epicureans in his earlier years. Accordingly, deftly transferring his own judgment to the backs of the people, Horace asserts (319-323) that to them a work showing occasional outstanding passages, highly wrought, (*interdum speciosa locis*) and with sound delineation of character (*recte morata*) even though lacking the dignity (*pondus*) associated with lofty themes, art and charm will give more pleasure than meaningless vocalic effects.

We have already seen³ that Cicero in *Orator* 67 declined to make metre the test of poetry, and assigned a superior value to stylistic

¹ So in general Plato, *Phaedrus* 259 E, but both Plato and Socrates believe that the poets do not ordinarily possess this wisdom.

² *Op. cit.*, *Sokrates*, LXXII, pp. 90 ff.

³ *Supra*, p. 4.

diction (*clarissimus verborum luminibus* cf. Horace's *interdum speciosa locis*) and poetical inspiration. By virtue of these last qualities he sets Plato among the poets, as does Shelley. Barwick¹ has convincingly shown that the doctrine of Horace is ultimately of Platonic origin and perhaps reached him through the mediating influences of Heraclides and Neoptolemus.² Though Plato's discussions in the *Republic* and the *Laws* revolves around the same antithesis between the *ὠφέλιμον* and the *ἡδύ*,³ Plato like Horace aims at a mediation between the two conflicting 'slogans' of the schools.⁴ Moreover poetry like oratory is a *λόγος πρὸς τοὺς ἀκροατάς*. Therefore the perfect poem, composed by the inspired and perfectly trained poet, must be addressed to the perfectly born and perfectly trained auditor. Such a poem expresses at once the useful and the pleasing. There is no conflict between aesthetic pleasure and ethical excellence in the ideal state. I shall quote a passage from Plato's *Laws* 2, 658 E, which, I believe, in ultimate analysis exercised an important influence upon Horace's contrasted pictures of Greek education (323-324) and Roman education (325-332). Plato declares: *συγχωρῶ δὴ τό γε τοσοῦτον καὶ ἐγὼ τοῖς πολλοῖς δεῖν τὴν μουσικὴν⁵ ἡδονῇ κρίνεσθαι, μὴ μέντοι τῶν γε ἐπιτυχόντων, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐκείνην εἶναι μούσαν καλλίστην ἥτις τοὺς βελτίστους καὶ ἱκανῶς πεπαιδευμένους τέρπει, μάλιστα δὲ ἥτις ἕνα τὸν ἀρετῇ τε καὶ παιδείᾳ διαφέροντα.*

Turning now to Horace 323-324:

Grais ingenium, Grais dedit ore rotundo
Musa loqui, praeter laudem⁶ nullius avaris.

we find a picture of an aesthetic but actually attained Utopia of Greece contrasted with the picture of the purely acquisitive education of the Romans.⁷ Can creative literature live in such an atmosphere:

¹ *Op. cit.*, *Hermes*, LVII, pp. 56 and 57.

² Compare Plato's *Republic* 2, 376 E-3, 398 B; 10, 598 D-608; *Laws* 2, 654-670: 7, 796 E-809.

³ Cf. Barwick's summary of these antithetic catch words, *op. cit.*, *Hermes*, LVII, p. 56, note 2.

⁴ For the attitude taken by Philodemus and perhaps by Neoptolemus on this debate compare Jensen, *op. cit.* pp. 8, 25 ff., 32 ff. *Supra* p. 4.

⁵ On the effect of vulgar music, cf. Plato *Laws* 7, 802 C.

⁶ For this use of *laus* correlative to the Greek ideal of *ἀρετή* cf. Cicero *Orator* 103, 231, with Kroll's notes.

⁷ Cf. Cicero *Tusculanae Disputationes* 1, 2, 4-5.

cum semel inbuerit, speramus carmina fingi
posse linenda cedro et levi servanda cupresso?

Dour and practical Rome affords but a sterile soil for the flower of poetry. Why? Because it is barren of philosophy. So Cicero says of the orator (*Orator* 14): *positum sit igitur in primis quod post magis intellexeretur, sine philosophia non posse effici quem quaerimus eloquentem*. The same applies *paribus passibus* to the poet. In particular, if we substitute poetry for oratory in the *Orator* 12, 13, and 14, the analogy with the lines which we have been discussing is rather striking. So in Horace the poet trained (310) by the study of the *Socraticae chartae* will, to apply Cicero's phrase, have *ubertas et quasi silva dicendi ducta ab illis* (i.e. the philosophers), for as Horace phrases it, *verbaque provisam rem non invita sequentur*. In addition he will know life to the full in the highest sense of that phrase, as revealed in the manifold ramifications of the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκαστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα*. These qualities will be reflected (317-318) in the content and style of his work. On the other hand how can immortal poetry proceed from the Roman system of education? As the Pseudo-Longinus declares it (*περὶ ὕψους* 44, 6): *φιλοχρηματία νόσημα μικροποιόν*.

After completing this argument for the education of the poet in philosophy and in life, and having shown the sterility of a civilization which lacks either (309-332),¹ Horace (in lines 333-407) turns, as Barwick² has correctly shown, to the question of *tractatio* from the point of view of the poet's task. He begins his consideration of the *tractatio* with the famous lines 333-334:

aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae
aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae.³

¹ Cf. Barwick *op. cit.*, *Hermes*, LVII, p. 49.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 51 ff.

³ Cf. Martianus Capella ed. Eyssenhard, p. 183, line 26, 485 and Apsines R. G. 1, p. 297, 28 p. -H. Moreover Barwick, who on page 52 gives his scheme for the disposition of the *Ars Poetica*, points out that its two divisions of *τέχνη* and *τεχνίτης* follow the Heracleidean *τέχνη ρητορική*. He ventures to infer, therefore, that the treatment of *doctrina*, *natura*, and *exercitatio* under *tractatio* must go back to the Heracleidean rhetoric. For the distribution of topics under the generic topic of *tractatio*, see Norden. Cf. also *De Partitione Oratoria* 8, 27, which is quite similar in doctrine.

As Norden has pointed out,¹ the goal, *τέλος* (*finis*), of the poet and his *ἔργον* (*officium*) are closely related. So Cicero in the *Orator* 72: *Hunc locum* (*πρέπον decorum*) *philosophi solent in officiis tractare, grammatici in poetis, eloquentes in omni et genere et parte causarum.*² The relations between the *officium poetae* and the *finis poetae* are hardly formulated by Horace with the same definiteness with which the *officium oratoris* and the *finis oratoris* appear in rhetorical theory.³ Even in rhetorical theory, as Norden himself acknowledges, the two are sometimes fused.⁴

The *officium poetae* of Horace, as just quoted, is subdivided into the functions of *prodesse* and *delectare*. Horace does not need to take up the third *officium* of the poet, *movere*, for the reason that, in general accordance with the Hellenistic and Aristotelian doctrines of *πάθος*, he had already considered it under the rubric *ars*, especially in lines 101 ff.,⁵ and I may add that the question of *πάθος* is inextricably bound up with his treatment of the dramatic forms (153-294 *passim*).

In this twofold division it is clear that *prodesse* is equivalent to *docere*, and that *prodesse-docere* represents the Stoic conception of the function of poet and orator alike. On the other hand the Peripatos holds that the function of poetry is *delectare*. Accordingly in line 334:

aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae.

Horace answers the question whether any mediation is possible between these opposed tenets of the schools, in the affirmative in lines 343 and 344:

omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,
lectorem delectando pariterque monendo.

¹ *Op. cit.* *Hermes*, XL, p. 501.

² Cf. *supra*, pp. 13-16.

³ Thus in the introduction to his *De Inventione* 6, Cicero carefully defines the *officium* and the *finis*. On the other hand in the *De Oratore* 1, 31, 138, Cicero fuses the *officium* and the *finis*. Compare the definition given by Antonius in *De Oratore* 1, 49, 213. In the *De Oratore* 2, 27, 114 ff. Antonius differentiates the *τέλος* or general goal of oratory, which is designed to persuade, from the three *officia oratoris* by which persuasion is attained. Compare especially 115: *ita omnes ratio dicendi tribus ad persuadendum rebus est nixa: ut probemus vera esse, quae defendimus; ut conciliemus eos nobis qui audiunt; ut animos eorum ad quemcumque causa postulabit motum, vocemus.*

⁴ *Op. cit.*, *Hermes*, XL, pp. 501-502.

⁵ *Supra*, pp. 33-36.

This compromise is of course not original with Horace.¹ It reaches him by way of a long rhetorical tradition which goes back in ultimate analysis to Plato's attitude towards poetry and the poets, and has perhaps in part been filtered through to Horace by way of the rhetorical works of Heracleides and Neoptolemus.

Now the τέχνηαι ῥητορικαί knew both a twofold and a threefold division of the *officia oratoris*. The twofold division is preserved to us in Cicero's *De Partitione Oratoria* and Martianus Capella. It is also possibly found in Heracleides. This system recognized that the function of the orator was *docere* and *movere*, that of the poet *docere* and *delectare*. But along with this twofold scheme there grew up a threefold scheme which in Roman rhetoric is represented in the *De Oratore*² and *Orator* of Cicero and in Quintilian. Antonius, in the *De Oratore* 2, 29, 128, discusses this system in detail. Similarly Quintilian 3, 5, 2 declares: *tria sunt item, quae praestare debeat orator, ut doceat, moveat, delectet*. But Quintilian is also familiar with the twofold division which he immediately quotes: *haec enim clarior divisio quam eorum qui totum opus in res (docere) et in adfectus (movere) partiuntur*. Probably from the twofold Heracleidean division this threefold division is evolved, perhaps by Theophrastus.³

In the *Orator* the most detailed discussion of the *officium oratoris* is contained in 69. Cicero here defines his perfect orator:

erit igitur eloquens — hunc enim auctore Antonio quaerimus — is, qui in foro causisque civilibus ita dicet, ut probet, ut delectet, ut flectat: probare necessitatis est, delectare suavitatis, flectere victoriae; nam id unum ex omnibus ad obtinendas causas potest plurimum. sed quot officia oratoris, tot sunt genera dicendi: subtile in probando, modicum in delectando, vehementer in flectendo; in quo uno vis omnis oratoris est. magni igitur iudicii, summae etiam facultatis esse debet moderator ille et quasi temperator huius tripertitae varietatis; nam et iudicabit, qui cuique opus sit, et poterit quocumque modo postulabit causa dicere.

In this passage it is evident that the three *officia* of the orator are brought into relationship with the three *genera dicendi*.⁴ Thus *docere* or *probare* is associated with the *genus tenue* (γένος ἰσχνόν), to which

¹ As Kroll, *op. cit.*, p. 88 and Barwick, *op. cit.*, p. 56 have seen.

² Cf. *De Oratore* 2, 27, 114 ff.

³ Cf. Barwick, *op. cit.*, p. 56 note 1.

⁴ For Horace's theory of ἥθος and πάθος in the *Ars Poetica* cf. *supra*, pp. 33-36.

style the epithet *subtilis* is frequently applied. With the middle style, the *genus modicum* (γένος μέσον) is associated *delectare*; while with the *genus grande* (γένος ὑψηλόν) are associated such epithets as *gravis*, *acer*, *ardens*,¹ and here *vehemens*.²

It may be noted further that just as Cicero considers that the greatest orator will be able to blend all three styles in proper proportion to his need, so Horace raises the question in line 334 as to the proper fusion of the Stoic aim of instruction (*prodesse*) and the Peripatetic aim of delight (*delectare*). Then after showing how instruction and delight are to be attained, he answers in the affirmative (343-344) the question as to whether one should attempt to fuse these aims. His answer is based (341-342) on the diversity of composition in the audience, that is, rhetorically speaking, upon the *πρέπον καθ' ἑκαστον πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα*.³

But it is also to be remembered that a specific *genre* may be related to a specific *officium*. Thus epideictic oratory is particularly related to delight.⁴ So philosophers (63) seek to calm rather than to raise the emotions. So also the sophists, *Orator* 65. Again in his treatment of the ἠθικόν, *Orator* 128, Cicero emphasizes the fact that we have a function of the orator which is *come, iucundum, ad benevolentiam conciliandam paratum*. In 120, Cicero emphasizes the pleasure brought by the citation of the *commemoratio antiquitatis exemplorumque prolatio*.⁵

It is quite true that Horace has no explicit discussion of the relation of the *officia poetae* to the various poetic *genres*.⁶ Nevertheless one may doubt whether in lines 343-344 of the *Ars Poetica* he would so strongly have insisted on the fusion of the *utile* and the *dulce*, the *delectando* and the *monendo*, had he not sought, following the *lex operum*, to blend these *officia* in his *sermones* and *epistulae*, to a notable degree in the

¹ See *Orator* 97, especially on the grand style.

² On some of the epithets applied to the various styles see Geigenmueller, *Quaestiones Dionysianae de vocabulis artis criticae*, index, s.v. *grandis*, *sublimis*, *vehemens*. Cf. also *supra*, p. 26.

³ On the relation of the *officia oratoris* to the *tria genera dicendi*, *supra*, pp. 34-36.

⁴ *Orator*, 37, 38.

⁵ For the function of the *ius civile* and history, cf. Kroll *ad loc.*

⁶ Cf. Jensen, *Abhandlungen der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin*, 1918, *philosophisch-historische Klasse*, No. 14, "Neoptolemus und Horaz," p. 24.

Ars Poetica itself, and also in those odes which are not mere *vers de société* or occasional compositions. The Horatian lines 333-334:

aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae
aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae,¹

are probably related to lines associated with some critic quoted by Philodemus, perhaps Neoptolemus in fragment XIII:¹ δ' εἶπω] ν ἀρμονίαν ἢ συντέλεια]ν καὶ τοῖς μ[εγάλοις πο]ιήμασιν περιθεῖναι δεῖν] καὶ πρὸς ἀρε[τὴν δεῖν τ]ῷ τελείῳ ποι[ητῇ μετὰ τ]ῆς [ψ]υχαραγωγ[γία]s τοῦ τοῦs] ἀκούοντ[ας] ὡ[φελεῖ]ν καὶ χρησι[μολογεῖ]ν.

In the *Orator* 139, Cicero treats certain of the ἀρεταὶ τῆς λέξεως: *atque alias etiam dicendi quasi virtutes sequetur; brevitatem, si res petet . . . saepe vitae naturarumque imitatio* (i.e. ἡθοποιῖα). So Horace (335-337) insists on brevity of injunction, clearly a virtue of the plain style, whose function is to teach.

In the *genres* related to the grand style, the goal of which is pleasure, we must have fidelity to life and probability (338-340):

ficta voluptatis causa sint proxima veris:
ne quodcumque volet poscat sibi fabula credi,
neu pransae Lamiae vivum puerum extrahat alvo.

The doctrine of this passage is closely related to that of Sextus *Adversus Grammaticos*, p. 658 B: πλᾶσμα δὲ πραγμάτων μὴ γενομένων μὲν, ὁμοίως δὲ τοῖς γενομένοις λεγομένων ὥς αἱ κωμικαὶ ὑποθέσεις καὶ οἱ μῦμοι. On the other hand, Sextus *Fabula*, 339, we read of: μῦθος πραγμάτων ἀγενήτων καὶ ψευδῶν ἔκθεσις, ὥς ὅτι . . . ἐνέπουσι . . . τὸν Πήγασον λαιμοτομηθείσης τῆς Γόργονος ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐκθορεῖν.

Here we have a rhetorical doctrine² which regards history as the representation of actuality, πλᾶσμα as a representation of what has not happened, represented with verisimilitude, and μῦθος as the representation of what is at once improbable and untrue.

In the *Ars Poetica* 347-407, Horace discusses the postulate of the greatest possible perfection. He recognizes³ that absolute faultlessness is humanly speaking unattainable (347-365). Here too we see rhetorical influence at work. So in the introductory chapter of the *Orator* 3-6,⁴ Cicero expresses the difficulty of describing the perfect

¹ Notice that *idonea dicere vitae* reads like a Latin paraphrase of χρησιμολογεῖν.

² Jensen, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

³ *Supra*, pp. 49 f.

⁴ Cf. Quintilian *Inst. Orat.*, 10, 2, 9.

orator and the fear that the very attempt may deter worthy aspirants. He remembers, however, that a second or third place is honorable, and that the sweep of Plato did not deter Aristotle. Yet though mediocrity may be permitted to the orator,¹ it condemns the poets, as we have seen in lines 366-390.

The *τόπος* by virtue of which much more stringent demands are made of the poet than of the orator is found in Cicero's *De Oratore* 1, 26, 118:

itaque in eis artibus in quibus non utilitas quaeritur necessaria, sed animi libera quaedam oblectatio,² quam diligenter et quam prope fastidiose iudicamus: nullae enim lites neque controversiae sunt quae cogant homines sicut in foro non bonos oratores, item in theatros actores malos petiti.

The *ῥήτωρ τέλειος* or *orator perfectus* is, as we have seen, a very common designation in the *Orator* of Cicero, a designation probably elaborated by the Stoic school. Just as Quintilian in the preface of the twelfth book crowns his work on oratory with the picture of the perfect orator, so Horace ends his *Ars Poetica* with the picture of the perfect poet. Yet both the perfect orator and the perfect poet, being human, may nod. Compare with the *dormitans Homerus* of the *Ars Poetica* 359 the *dormitans Demosthenes* of Quintilian 12, 1, 22.

The section of the *Ars Poetica* on the perfect poet closes with a long passage in the heroic style on the civilizing mission of poetry (391-407). From primitive times poetry has founded towns, established law and order, and brought blessings of every sort. This is, of course, an extended rhetorical *τόπος*. In Cicero's *Tusculanae Disputationes* 5, 5, we have the parallel *τόπος* of the praise of philosophy and its civilizing mission. In the *De Oratore*, 1, 8, 30-34, we have the praise of oratory put into the mouth of Crassus. Likewise in the *De Inventione* 1, 2 ff., we have the same praise of oratory, based, as Hubbell has con-

¹ For the recognition of the value of the *mediocris orator*, see *Brutus* 193; *De Oratore* 1, 24, 110 ff.; 26, 118; 28, 129; and 2, 20, 85 and 86; in 2, 44, 187, the power of the orator is compared to that of the good commander over his troops. Cf. also 2, 74, 299. In the *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* 6, Cicero discusses the perfect, the mediocre, and the poor orator, but accepts all three. Cf. *De Inventione* 1, 1 for a contrast between the *bonus* and the *malus orator*. On the *malus orator* see *De Oratore* 2, 20, 85; 44, 175.

² That is, music and poetry. Cf. Horace, *Ars Poetica* 378: *sic animis natum inventumque poema iuvandis*.

clusively shown, on Isocrates' account of the growth of civilization through the power of λόγος, and related to passages in Aristides and Dionysius.¹

As the appropriate background for the study of the Horatian passage (391-407) on the civilizing power of poetry I shall quote a paragraph from Hubbell's study² for the reason that the rhetorical source of Horace's passage here and the somewhat similar passage in the epistles 2, 1, 119-138 is closely related to this commonplace on the power of rhetoric:

One of the striking passages in Isocrates is his account of the growth of civilization through the power of λόγος (Nic. 5-8. = Ant., 253-256). This was utilized by Cicero and appears in Aristides. The latter casts the story in the form of a myth. Newly created man was inferior to the animals, and was in danger of being utterly destroyed. Prometheus pleaded with Zeus to save the human race. At his suggestion Zeus sent Hermes to bestow on mankind the blessings of rhetoric. Under its influence men ceased quarreling with one another, formed communities, built cities, and made laws.

Let us now turn to the passage in the *Ars Poetica*, 391-407. Here, in lines 391-396, Horace, using the well-worn commonplace of the power of the music of Orpheus, the *interpres deorum*, shows that the divine bard sowed the seeds of the moral law among wild and primitive men. Such, in accordance with the allegorical Stoic method of interpretation, is the true meaning of the myth by which he is said to have soothed ravening lions and tigers. By virtue of poetry, then, man civilizes the human denizens of the woodlands. In a word he becomes the interpreter of the divine law from which human law was later to arise. So also the myth of Amphion, allegorically interpreted, associates poetry with the foundation of the city state, for Thebes³ passed in later times for the oldest city state of Greece.

In ultimate analysis, also (lines 396-399), it is poetry, the precursor of formal prose philosophy, which embodied primitive wisdom and law in metrical or rhythmical form,⁴ and established the enactments of

¹ Harry Mortimer Hubbell, *The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius, and Aristides*, Yale Dissertation, 1913, pp. 54 ff.

² P. 55.

³ Varro *Res Rusticae* 3, 1.

⁴ Compare the '*carmina*' cited from early Roman law in Livy, Book 1, *passim*.

public, private, and divine jurisprudence. Hence we may properly pay the highest honors to divine poesy and the inspired bards (400-401).¹

Then, passing to the orderly and progressive development of the city state, Horace shows how the strains of poetry pervade and animate all the activities of life. First Homer ὁ ποιητής, then Tyrtæus with his martial elegies and marching anapaests. There follow hexameters in which the oracles expound the will of the gods; then didactic poetry which points out the hard way which the human pilgrim must travel, as in Hesiod's *Works and Days*; next the *gratia regum* as realized in the Melic poetry of Pindar and Simonides, in praise of Sicilian and Thessalian potentates; then the musical and poetical accompaniments of festival, drinking bout, and love, as expressed in the more personal lyrics of Alcaeus, Anacreon, and Sappho, and the dramatic festival which marks the end of the season's labor. In view of this record of high accomplishment for man and state even the Roman amateur of poetry need not blush to be the follower of the Muse. He traces his spiritual descent to Apollo himself

ne forte pudori
sit tibi Musa lyra sollers et cantor Apollo.

How is this ideal of the perfect poet, the counter type of the perfect orator, to be attained? This question is answered categorically in lines 408-415, in terms of the rhetorical commonplace which assesses at their appropriate values the conflicting claims of φύσις (*natura*), μελέτη (*exercitatio* or *emendatio*), i.e. technical training, and ἐπιστήμη (*studium*). Professor Shorey has traced the ramifications of this commonplace.² It remained, however, for Barwick³ to point out the importance that this commonplace holds as a determining conception for the disposition of professional exposition of the various arts or sciences under the rubrics τέχνη and τεχνίτης. Thus the personality of the τεχνίτης may be subdivided for convenience of exposition into the same three categories of the rhetorical commonplace discussed by Shorey. In his *Phaedrus* (269 D), Plato mentions these three as the prerequisites for the effective orator.

¹ So Strabo 1, c. 20 and 10, c. 468, regards poetry as the predecessor of philosophy in such tasks.

² *Op. cit.* (See *supra*, p. 7.)

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

Apparently Heracleides had followed Plato in this doctrine. Plato, however, clearly reveals the consciousness that these three are not prerequisites for oratory alone. Thus Aristotle¹ mentions φύσις, μάθησις, and ἀσκησις as the three requisites for education. Much later the *Auctor ad Herennium* 1, 2, 3,² mentions *ingenium*, *doctrina*, *praeceptio* (*ars*) as the prerequisites for all the arts. Heracleides closely related these three qualities to the *tractatio* under the rubric τεχνίτης. This method of treatment admits of easy and varying application to all the arts and sciences. Norden³ has shown conclusively that this method of treatment by the categories τέχνη and τεχνίτης was widely spread.

Again if Jensen is right⁴ in his reconstruction of the doctrines of Neoptolemus from the Herculean papyri, Neoptolemus also developed the concept that in the poet artistic training (τέχνη) and natural gifts (δύναμις) must be harmoniously blended. This consideration led him to essentially the same scheme of disposition which Horace adopts in the *Ars Poetica*.

This conception of the harmonious trinity of φύσις, μελέτη, and ἐπιστήμη pervaded both the *De Oratore* and the *Orator* of Cicero before it reached Horace in the *Ars Poetica*. Is it not likely, therefore, that Horace was influenced by the Ciceronian formulation of the commonplace as well as by its treatment in the Greek rhetoricians? The commonplace pervades the initial chapters of the first book of the *De Oratore*, 1-34. In 30-34, in particular, Crassus begins with a eulogy on oratory as an indispensable instrument for the welfare of the state. This passage I have already cited⁵ as a rhetorical commonplace parallel to Horace's praise of poetry (391-407). At the close of chapter 34 Cicero speaks of the blessings which the perfect orator brings: *ac ne plura, quae sint innumerabilia, consector, comprehendam brevi: sic enim statuo, perfecti oratoris moderatione et sapientia . . . universae rei publicae salutem maxime contineri*. He then continues his argument on the importance of *studium*, as Horace does following his digression

¹ *Apud Diog. Laert.* 5, 18.

² Cf. Barwick, *op. cit.*, p. 44, note 1.

³ *Op. cit.*, *Hermes*, XL, pp. 508-528.

⁴ If wrong, one or more other poets criticized by Philodemus employed the commonplace. Cf. Jensen, *op. cit.*, p. 43 (*supra*, p. 4).

⁵ *Supra*, p. 65.

on the civilizing powers of oratory. Similarly Quintilian, 12, 11, 10, closes his picture of the ideal orator with the exhortation to tireless study.

Curiously enough, the modern critics of the *Ars Poetica*, even including Norden, do not seem to emphasize what, to be sure, is obvious, that the whole argument of Crassus in book 1 of the *De Oratore* is based on the same necessity of uniting in the personality of the orator natural capacity (*natura*), sound training (*exercitatio*) — he describes his own in detail (137–147) — and a liberal education (148–159 *passim*).

Similarly at the very beginning of the *Orator*, chapter 4, Cicero asserts the importance of combining natural ability with study in the great liberal disciplines. Continuing in 11–19, Cicero asserts that the perfect orator is unthinkable without philosophy, just as Horace in line 310 insists on the study of the *Socraticae chartae*.¹ Finally in 17 Cicero argues by clear implication for *μελέτη* or technical training, when he asserts that, for the expansion of the subject matter (*res*) derived from philosophy, one needs rhetorical ornamentation (*ornamenta*, κατασκευὴ τῆς λέξεως).² These, however, can only be learned from the rhetoricians.

In 113–120 of the *Orator*, Cicero insists on the knowledge (*studium*) of philosophy, law, and rhetoric for his perfect orator. That is, Cicero (especially in 118), like Horace, prescribes *studium*. In addition, as Cicero continues (121–125), the perfect orator must know the technical rules of the rhetorical schools (125–127). That is, he must have attained what Horace describes, though he does not explicitly use the term, as *emendatio*.³

Horace's famous lines are the classic formulation of this famous *τόπος*, which to my mind cannot be too often repeated, if modern poetry is to echo the emotional and spiritual experiences of humanity,

¹ Cf. *supra*, pp. 54–56.

² Cf. Kroll's summary *ad loc.*

³ Cicero also insists elsewhere on *exercitatio* and *diligentia*. Cf. *Brutus* 169, 233, 305. A somewhat similar triad of qualities is known to the *Auctor ad Herennium* who in book 1, 2–3, says: *haec omnia tribus rebus adsequi poterimus, arte, imitatione, exercitatione. Ars est praeceptio, quae dat certam viam rationem dicendi; imitatio est, qua impellimur cum diligenti ratione ut aliquorum similis in dicendo velimus esse; exercitatio est assiduus usus consuetudoque dicendi*. Cf. also *Auctor ad Herennium* 3, 16, where natural and artificial memory (i.e. mnemonic systems) are contrasted.

and not to be the effusion, undiscriminated by the intelligence, of the superficial and non-sequential stream of egocentric imagism:

natura fieret laudabile carmen an arte,
quaesitum est. ego nec studium sine divite vena,
nec rude quid prosit video ingenium: alterius sic
altera poscit opem res et coniurat amice.

It is interesting to notice that in this long continued debate between the claims of inspiration on the one hand, and literary culture and literary craftsmanship on the other, Horace takes his stand with Aristotle and the writers of Hellenistic rhetoric. He opposes, especially by the picture of the *demens poeta* in 452-476, the Democritean and Platonic thesis of the Dionysiac or inspired poet.¹ Democritus' attitude towards *ingenium* is scored by Horace in lines 295 ff.:

ingenium misera quia fortunatius arte
credit et excludit sanos Helicone poetas
Democritus, bona pars non unguis ponere curat,
non barbam, secreta petit loca, balnea vitat.²

In reality Democritus seems merely to have insisted upon inspiration as a *sine qua non* for true poetry; he did not assert that inspiration was the exclusive source of poetry. Yet perversion of his remarks was easy for those who in every age have sought to separate their own spiritual and emotional impressionism as something unique in human experience, and to accentuate their unique position by the agglomeration of bizarre and external eccentricities of manners and dress.³

Doubtless Horace⁴ has formulated his antithesis somewhat too sharply, for it may be doubted if there existed a group which maintained that the good poet (orator) could be made by art alone. We

¹ For Horace's occasional attitude towards Dionysiac enthusiasm and poetic inspiration, see *Carmina*, II 19, III 4; for the general trend of his criticism on the inspired poet, see my *Lucilius and Horace*, p. 31.

² So Clement, *Strom.* b 168, quotes Democritus as saying: ποιητῆς δὲ ἄσσα μὲν ἂν γράφη μετ' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ καὶ ἱεροῦ πνεύματος καλὰ κάρτα ἐστίν. Cf. also Dio. Chrys. 53, 1 frag. 21, of Homer as the inspired poet. Also Cicero *De Divinatione* I, 37, 80.

³ Cf. Irving Babbitt, *Rousseau and Romanticism*, chapter 2, Romantic Genius, pp. 32-70, especially pages 62 ff. For Plato's attitude towards inspiration, cf. *Ion* 533 E.

⁴ Cf. Heinze-Kießling *ad loc.*

must rather think that the question was phrased as in Quintilian 2, 19:¹ *naturane plus ad eloquentiam conferat an doctrina*.

Horace's own creed that *studium* and *ingenium* must not be put in hostile camps, but must work in friendly alliance, is clearly a reflection of Hellenistic rhetorical lore, for we find the same doctrine insisted upon in Longinus² *περὶ ὕψους* 36, 4: προσήκει βοήθημα τῇ φύσει πάντῃ πορίζεσθαι τὴν τέχνην· ἡ γὰρ ἀλληλουχία τούτων ἴσως γένοιτ' ἂν τὸ τέλειον.

It seems clear that *Ars Poetica* 408-415 gives the answer to the question how perfection is to be attained by self-training without the aid of a critic. But as the great landscape painter Constable once said,³ "A self-taught artist is one taught by a very ignorant person." These lines pave the way, therefore, to the two companion portraits of the κόλαξ or insincere critic, and his relation to the pseudo-poet who seeks applause, not perfection (416-433) and the counter portrait of the true relation between Horace himself and the perfect critic Quintilius Varus (433-451). In my judgment these two pictures must be taken together. The first, painted in satiric colors (*σπουδαιογελοίως*) from a *διατριβή* on the subject *περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἂν τις διακρίνειε τὸν κόλακα τοῦ φίλου* answers the question *quo ferat error* so far as *emendatio* or *exercitatio* is concerned. On the other hand the companion picture of Horace's relation with Quintilius Varus shows how true criticism and true friendship will proceed with a poem showing the results of *ingenium* and *studium*, but which still requires the aid of expert criticism (*emendatio*). Taken together these two pictures, which are inserted chiasmatically between the picture of the perfect poet *in posse*, lines 408-415, and the mad poet *in esse*, lines 453-476, bind together the whole concluding portion of the *Ars Poetica*. The perfect poet *in posse* has been dowered by nature with *ingenium*: he has even added thereto an exacting cultural discipline. He must go farther, however, and lines 416-437 sketch the wrong method of procedure in reference to *μελέτη* or *exercitatio*, a method which no true poet will take, while lines 438 ff. sketch the friendly working alliance (*amice coniurat*) be-

¹ See also Quintilian *praefatio* 29; 12, 5, 2, and compare Vitruvius *de architectura* 1, 1, 3, and Cicero *pro Archia poeta* 7, 15.

² But compare *περὶ ὕψους*, 2, 2.

³ See my *Lucilius and Horace*, p. 247.

tween true criticism and true friendship. We have, then, not attained our complete picture of the perfect poet until we have had Horace's picture of his critical and friendly relationship to Quintilius Varus.¹

The ascetic nature of training is, according to Horace, lines 413-415, quite as exacting as that for athletics or music:

qui studet optatam cursu contingere metam,
multa tulit fecitque puer, sudavit et alsit,
abstinuit Venere et vino; qui Pythia cantat
tibicen, didicit prius extimuitque magistrum.

We have no precise parallel to these lines in Cicero's *Orator*, yet it is essential to notice that, in the proem to that work, Cicero insists on the difficulty of forming the perfect orator, and almost fears lest he may discourage talented aspirants. However, he will persist, encouraged by the reflection that *virī excellentes* are not deterred from *optima studia* by such fears. I shall quote as similar to Horace's lines in spirit a passage from the *Orator* 3: *in quo vereor, ne, si id quod vis efficerō eumque oratorem quem quaeris expressero, tardem studia multorum, qui desperatione debilitati experiri id nolent, quod se assequi posse diffidant*. Similar passages might be cited from the *De Oratore*.²

Horace closes his *Ars Poetica* with the picture of the *demens poeta*, who serves as a foil for the *perfectus poeta*. It is hardly necessary to do more than summarize Norden's admirable remarks under this head. Rhetorical analogies are unquestionably operative here. Thus Cicero in *De Oratore* 3, 14, 55 sketches in Stoic colors the *ῥήτωρ φαῦλος*, who is mad, in contrast with the *ῥήτωρ τέλειος*:

est enim eloquentia una quaedam de summis virtutibus: quamquam sunt omnes virtutes aequales et pares, sed tamen est specie alia magis alia formosa et inlustris, sicut haec vis, quae scientiam complexa rerum sensa mentis et consilia sic verbis explicat ut eos, qui audiant, quocumque incubuerit, possit impellere; quae quo maior est vis, hoc est magis probitate iungenda summaque prudentia; quarum virtutum expertibus si dicendi copiam tradiderimus, non eos quidem oratores effecerimus, sed furentibus quaedam arma dederimus.

¹ It will be noticed that this analysis seeks a mediation between that of Norden and Jensen on the one hand, and that of Barwick, *op. cit.*, 52 and 53, on the other. Unquestionably *μελέτη* involves the critic-teacher.

² *De Oratore* 1, 3, 11 is interesting because of the comparison between poets and orators, 1, 59, 250; 1, 60, 257 (*multi sudoris est*). See also *Brutus*, 25.

In connection with the insistence on *probitas* and *prudencia* in this passage it is interesting to note that in the *Ars Poetica*, in line 445, Quintilius has been generalized into the ideal literary critic, who is thus described:

vir bonus et prudens versus reprehendit inertis, etc.

Again in the *Orator* 99¹ Cicero sets forth the besetting dangers of the orator who commands the grand style alone. At least, he who commands the plain style is *sapiens*; he who commands the middle style is *suavis*, but he who commands the grand style to the exclusion of all others is virtually mad:

hic autem copiosissimus, si nihil est aliud, vix satis sanus videri solet. . . . Si is non praeparatis auribus inflammare rem coepit, furere apud sanos et quasi inter sobrios bacchari vinulentus videtur.

In the concluding lines of the *Ars Poetica*, 453-476, Horace presents with inimitable irony the picture of the *demens poeta*, and shows that his *μᾶνία* consists in a defective sense of humane reality. He suffers from megalomania in that like Empedocles (line 464) he desires to be considered a god; his egocentric and exclusive dependence on his own *ingenium* is in Horace's judgment the tragic cause of his destruction. In a sense the rather severe judgment of line 466 *sit ius liceatque perire poetis* reechoes and answers in terms of humanity lines 9 and 10:

pictoribus atque poetis
quidlibet audendi semper fuit aequa potestas.

The daring even of poets must yield to the limitations of a hard won art and a sense of propriety, which is after all a sense of that higher beauty which resides within the limits of symmetry. Or, to phrase it differently, a classical art must be commensurable with our common human experience and not tangential to it.

I have so carefully analyzed and compared the argumentative sequences of the *Orator* and the *Ars Poetica*, that any final summary of my results seems unnecessary. It will be enough to state once more that I have not sought to prove that the *Orator* is the exclusive source of the *Ars Poetica*, or to insist on any exact verbal influence binding Cicero's work to that of Horace. It has rather been my effort to show that the *Orator* is simply one of the cloud of rhetorical witnesses which encompasses the *Ars Poetica* and at the same time forms the enviroing

¹ Cf. also Cicero *Brutus* 233 on the mad orator Gaius Fimbria.

field from which Horace's great imitative and creative work sprung. Both works find their proper place within a *stemma* of rhetorical content whose lines of descent after years of study someone may be able to plot. My present task has been rather to indicate some of the horizontals and diagonals which surely connect the *Orator* of Cicero with the *Ars Poetica* of Horace. In the immediate future I shall hope to turn to Cicero's greatest rhetorical work, the *De Oratore*, and to attempt to unravel the mesh of interlacing relationships between the *De Oratore*, the *Orator*, and the *Ars Poetica*. Miss Grant's collation of material upon the *De Oratore* is rich and full of interest.

In closing this long study, it is not inappropriate to recall that perhaps the greatest representative and interpreter of the Comic Spirit in modern English literature, one who would receive worthy welcome to the ranks of the ancient *σπουδαιογέλοιοι*, has passed a judgment humorous, sane, and Horatian, upon the last gesture of the mad poet Empedocles. I refer, of course, to the Empedocles of George Meredith.

EMPEDOCLES

He leaped. With none to hinder,
Of Aetna's fiery scoriae
In the next vomit-shower, made he
A more peculiar cinder.
And this great Doctor, can it be,
He left no saner recipe
For men at issue with despair?
Admiring, even his poet owns,
While noting his fine lyric tones,
The last of him was heels in air!

Comes Reverence, her features
Amazed to see high Wisdom hear,
With glimmer of a faunish leer,
One mock her pride of creatures.
Shall such sad incident degrade
A stature casting sunniest shade?
O Reverence! let Reason swim;
Each life its critic deed reveals;
And him reads Reason at his heels
If heels in air the last of him.

CHACHRYLION AND HIS VASES ¹

BY KATE MCKNIGHT ELDERKIN

INTRODUCTION

CHACHRYLION is one of the few masters, worthy of interest, who have been almost entirely neglected for more than thirty years, since the appearance of Hartwig's "Meisterschalen" ² in which he adds two signed vases and nine attributed vases to Klein's list of thirteen kylixes and one plate.³ Perrot ⁴ has added another vase from Gela ⁵ which, however, he considers to be an ancient forgery. Beazley ⁶ believes that all the vases signed by Chachrylion were not painted by the same man and gives his Boston Cup to the "Hermaios Painter."

¹ This article was presented as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Radcliffe College in 1922. The author wishes to express her gratitude to Professor George H. Chase for his never-failing interest and helpful criticism during its preparation.

For the titles of books frequently referred to, the following abbreviations are used:

Beazley. J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red-Figured Vases in American Museums*. Cambridge, 1918.

Harrison and MacColl. J. E. Harrison and D. S. MacColl, *Greek Vase Paintings*. London, 1894.

Hartwig. P. Hartwig, *Die griechischen Meisterschalen des strengen rotfigurigen Stils*. Stuttgart, 1893.

Hoppin. J. C. Hoppin, *A Handbook of Attic Red-Figured Vases*. Cambridge, 1919.

Klein. W. Klein, *Die griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen*. 2d edition. Vienna, 1887.

Perrot and Chipiez. G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité*, Vol. X. Paris, 1910.

Pottier. E. Pottier, *Vases Antiques du Louvre*. Vol. II. Paris, 1901.

Walters. Walters, H. B., *History of Ancient Pottery*. New York, 1905.

Under each vase only the reference to Hoppin has been given unless some publication has been used other than those noted by him.

² Hartwig, pp. 17-70.

³ Klein, pp. 124-130.

⁴ Perrot and Chipiez, X, pp. 380-386.

⁵ Hoppin, I, p. 173, no. 17.

⁶ Beazley, p. 14.

Hoppin¹ increases the list of signed works, bringing the number to twenty-one, with ten attributed vases. He is inclined to follow Beazley in his belief that the hands of several different painters may be seen on these vases,² but naturally in a work which professes to be only a catalogue, he draws no conclusions. Therefore, it seems permissible and indeed high time that some comprehensive treatment of Chachrylion's work should be attempted.

Chachrylion is one of the masters who signs ἐποίησεν throughout, therefore the troublesome question arises at the start in regard to the meaning of the signatures on Greek vases, a question which is far from settled at the present time. Of late there has been a marked tendency to consider the ἐποίησεν formula as belonging only to the owner of an atelier, who may or may not be directly responsible for the making of the vases and who certainly had nothing to do with the painting of his pottery. Such a theory has led to a number of complications and to a good deal of confusion in assigning ἐποίησεν vases to unknown artists, often on the ground of some half-imagined stylistic peculiarity.

Most scholars are disposed to agree that during the black-figured period ἐποίησεν stands for the painter of the vases as well as the potter, but they no longer hold this view in regard to red-figured vases. It would be interesting to trace just how this shift of opinion has come about, though it is not an easy matter to do so, as most authorities on the subject have shown a tendency to generalize without committing themselves to any very definite conclusions. However, I shall attempt to set down their various views in order of time.

According to Klein³ there are four different formulae for signing: (1) with ἐποίησεν alone; (2) with ἔγραψεν alone; (3) with ἐποίησεν and ἔγραψεν accompanied by a second name with the second verb; (4) by a use of both verbs with the same name, ἐποίησε καὶ ἔγραψεν. The signature ἐποίησεν during the archaic period, when only one name occurs, is generally taken to cover the work of one man as potter and painter combined. If formula 3 occurs, it is taken to mean that the man who signs with ἐποίησεν made the vase, while the one who signs with ἔγραψεν decorated it. When formula 4 appears, it is evident that the artist wishes to refer to both processes, the making as well as the

¹ Hoppin, I, pp. 146-178.

² *Ibid.*, p. 146.

³ Klein, p. 11.

painting. But Klein states¹ that already in archaic times the verb *ἐποίησεν* had developed a double meaning, and it may be taken as a general rule that the use of *ἐποίησεν* alone is simply a shortened form of formula 4, including the painting as well as the making. On the other hand, the use of *ἔγραψεν*, which occurs only five times on the archaic vases, in Klein's opinion has nothing whatsoever to do with the making of the vase, but refers merely to the painting.

From formula 3, "A *ἐποίησε* καὶ B *ἔγραψεν*," I believe the present proprietorship-theory has developed, for since *ἐποίησε* might also include the painting, obviously A is more important than B, who is not concerned with anything besides the painting. But it might often have happened that A had more work than he could do unassisted and so entrusted the painting to a skilled helper, B, probably working under his direction. We have a clear example of this on the Geryon kylix,² which seems to indicate that at some time during his career, Euphronios was working in the atelier of Chachrylion, painting on his fabric, and it is not at all unreasonable to suppose that Chachrylion was his teacher.³ If such were the case, the pupil far outstripped his master, for it is obvious that Chachrylion, toward the close of his period of activity, borrowed certain innovations of Euphronios and attempted to follow his style.

Hartwig does not discuss the matter of signatures, apparently feeling satisfied that Klein's statements are consistent, for he gives equal credit to the one who signs *ἐποίησεν* and to the one using *ἔγραψεν* and he considers both Oltos and Chachrylion as *painters* of the Epiktetan Cycle.⁴

Furtwängler⁵ states that *ἐποίησεν* indicates only the possessor of the shop. He believes that the owner may paint his own vases, but we may be sure that this is the case only when *ἔγραψεν* is used. Pottier⁶ proposes a somewhat different theory. In his opinion, *ἐποίησεν* indicates not merely the proprietor of the shop, but the maker of the vase as well; that is, the proprietor must have some definite part in the process. He may take part in preparing the clay, in fashioning it, baking or

¹ Klein, p. 14.

³ Harrison and MacColl, p. 16.

² Hoppin, I, p. 390.

⁴ Hartwig, p. 16.

⁵ Furtwängler und Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei*, I, pp. 103-104.

⁶ Pottier, *Catalogue des Vases peints du Louvre*, III, pp. 699 ff.

painting the vase, or may simply oversee the entire execution.¹ Whether ἐποίησεν includes the painting or not, at least it stands for the dominating person in the workshop, who is responsible for the conception of the forms and the designs carried out by his subordinates.

Hauser,² who clings to the earlier theory, does not agree with Pottier that ἐποίησεν stands only for the potter, for he feels that in this way the head masters lose all credit for personal manner and style. Pottier in replying to him³ says that it is not his intention to diminish the importance of the master in attributing to him only the choice of subjects and general disposition, that the merit of the painter in no way detracts from that of the composer, but only serves to complete it.

Beazley, who is the chief upholder of what I may call the proprietorship-theory, when discussing a cup in the Cabinet des Médailles⁴ signed Κλεοφράδης ἐποίησεν, says, "it is possible that Kleophrades not only manufactured it, but painted it with his own hand, but it is equally possible that someone else painted it."

Hoppin⁵ also takes up the question, but without any definite results, for though he considers ἐποίησεν to be a "hall-mark of the factory used by the proprietor," still it may or may not indicate that he was the painter as well. Hoppin believes that "artists began their careers as painters in workshops of well-established potters and later set up their own shops and employed subordinates in turn." This is all very well so far as it goes, but does it seem reasonable that an artist like Euphronios, who had signed ἔγραψεν during his earlier career, ceased to paint vases the moment he set up a shop for himself, thereby gaining the right to use ἐποίησεν? More likely Pottier's theory holds here, that *he* now oversaw the whole production and made designs from which his subordinates could work. A case in point is the Geryon kylix of Euphronios (Munich 2620), painted while he was employed by Chachrylion, the interior of which was practically copied by the painter Onesimos on a vase from Euphronios's shop (Louvre G 105). The design of the interior and certain details of the exterior are so similar to the interior of the Geryon kylix that were it not for the paint-

¹ Pottier, *Catalogue*, III, p. 704.

³ Pottier, *Mon. Piot*, 1909, p. 136.

² B. P. W., 1907, p. 694.

⁴ J. H. S., XXX, 1910, p. 38.

⁵ Hoppin, *Euthymides*² (Cambridge, 1917), pp. 26-28.

er's signature [ONEΞ]IMOΞ E·RAΘΣ . . it would unquestionably be given to the master's hand. On the interior of each is a single horse bearing a rider in travelling costume, wearing the petasos. The horses in each case have slender, graceful legs with exceptionally thin hock-joints; and a double division of the mane near the top of the head is characteristic of both. In fact, these two vases show the only instances of this treatment of the mane, so far as I know. The animals are spirited creatures, with heads held high and mouths open. Both riders sit erect, and though they wear different kinds of footgear, still the shoes worn by the rider on the Geryon kylix are duplicated in those worn by a youth holding a horse on the exterior of this same Onesimos vase. In spite of the striking similarity of the drawing on the two vases, the freer composition of the Onesimos vase, as well as the maeander pattern around the interior, points to a somewhat later date than the Geryon kylix. Moreover, this vase is necessarily later than the Geryon kylix, because Euphronios was at this time an independent potter employing others in turn. Such striking similarities as exist between the two vases, it seems to me, could only be due to a conscious effort on the part of Onesimos either to reproduce a stock design or to copy an earlier work of his master.

In regard to the *ἐγγραφεν* signature, Hoppin does not believe that it necessarily excludes the painter from the right to proprietorship, for Douris, though he always uses this formula, worked for three different potters, and on one vase has used the double formula, showing that at one time he was the master of a shop. Accordingly Hoppin thinks it probable that all the vases bearing his signature were from his own shop.¹ If this is true, and it seems more than likely, a similar method of reasoning is applicable to Epiktetos as well, who painted for five different vase makers and also owned a shop, as is shown by fragments of a plate at Athens signed [E]ΓΙΚΤΕΤΟΣ ΕΓΟΙ[ΕΣ Ε ΚΑΙ ΕΛΡ]ΑΦΣΕΝ.² In his case this serves to simplify matters, as it is difficult to see why an artist with the ability of Epiktetos would change workshops so frequently.

Beazley's latest attitude on the matter is summed up in his *Attic Red-Figured Vases in American Museums*,³ where he notes two kinds of signatures, namely, the proper name followed either by *ἐγγραφεν* or

¹ Hoppin, *Euthymides*², p. 28.

² Hoppin, I, p. 301.

³ Preface, p. v.

by ἐποίησεν. In the first case it means "so-and-so painted me"; in the second, "so-and-so made me." The first tells the name of the artist who painted the vase; the second, merely the name of the man who owned the workshop. This is the first definite statement of the proprietorship-theory and comes as a bolt from a clear sky, as I have been unable to detect the reasoning which has built up such a theory. But if there is any truth in it, when did this decided change in the meaning of the ἐποίησεν formula take place?

Certainly during the black-figured period it included the painting of the vases as well as the making,¹ and at this time the ἔγραψεν signature occurs only rarely. In addition to the four possible formulae for signing, there are some instances where black-figured vases are signed by two men, each making use of the ἐποίησεν formula, as in the case of Anakles and Nicosthenes (Berlin 1801),² and also Archikles and Glaukytes (Brit. Mus.).³ In these instances it is not possible that ἐποίησεν stands only for the potter, for it is hardly conceivable that two potters could be responsible for the shaping of the same vase.⁴ The natural conclusion is either that one man made the vase and the other painted it, thus using ἐποίησεν interchangeably for either process, or else, which seems more likely, since the signatures appear on opposite sides of the vase, that each artist was responsible for the painting of one side. In either case we certainly seem to have ἐποίησεν used for the painting of vases in the black-figured technique.

If then, when we come to the red-figured period, ἐποίησεν stands merely for the potter, that is to say, for the proprietor of the establishment, as some would have us suppose, when did this change of meaning take place? Such a decided change must have been a gradual growth, just as the reversal of technique from the black-figured to the red-figured style did not spring up over night. It seems only reasonable to suppose that there was a period of transition during which the old formula was maintained and when the signature ἐποίησεν occurring with only one name may be taken to cover the work of potter and painter combined.

An example of this sort has been noted by Miss Radford,⁵ namely

¹ Pottier, *Catalogue*, III, p. 701.

⁴ Pottier, *Catalogue*, III, p. 701.

² Klein, p. 75.

⁵ *J. H. S.*, XXXV, 1915, p. 107.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

the Gotha kylix¹ with the inscriptions [Γ]Α<ΙΑΔΕ< (retrograde) and ΝΙ> . . . Ε<ΕΝ. In this case Pasiades is the painter, but the style of the exterior is unmistakably that of his other decorated vase, which is signed with ἐπολήσεν. Therefore Miss Radford believes that at a time contemporary with Euphronios ἐπολήσεν might still include the painting of the vase.

Sotades, who shows the transitional style between the severe style and the fine style² furnishes another example where I believe that, in spite of the ἐπολήσεν formula, the same hand is responsible for decorating as well as for shaping the vases. There is no definite evidence for such a supposition, but it is based on the exquisite handling not only of the form but of the painting as well. No other potter has left such fragile shapes, and the delicate drawing is so individual and so charmingly adapted to the shape of the vase that it seems highly probable that the entire execution is due to the same artist.

In a review of Beazley's *Red-Figured Vases in American Museums*, Dr. Stephen B. Luce³ writes that he considers a general return to the old theory more than likely, namely, that the hand which made the vases also painted the designs. He bases his belief largely on the discoveries made by Mr. Jay Hambidge⁴ who shows conclusively that the Attic potter was a skilled artist using the greatest care and precision in the forming of his vase, and probably just as able in designing as in fashioning the shape.

Chachrylion is a master who uses ἐπολήσεν throughout. Perrot⁵ thinks that in so doing Chachrylion proves that all the work from his shop was done entirely by his own hand except the Geryon kylix, which bears the additional signature of Euphronios, and is so distinctly different in style from Chachrylion's work. Chachrylion is a master closely allied in his early work to the black-figured period and to Epiktetos; therefore, I believe that, as in the cases mentioned above, the formula ἐπολήσεν continued to be employed by him with its old connotation, as it had been used in the black-figured period. His style shows that he was trained in the school of Epiktetos, and numerous characteris-

¹ Hoppin, II, p. 328.

² Hoppin, II, p. 427.

³ *Classical Weekly*, Nov. 15, 1920.

⁴ *Dynamic Symmetry: The Greek Vase*.

⁵ Perrot and Chipiez, X, p. 381.

tics of the master appear in the work of the pupil. Among these the most noticeable are the slenderness of the figures and the small heads. In many respects, however, Chachrylion advanced beyond his teacher and threw off the traditions of the older school. For instance, on none of his works do eyes and animals appear on the exterior for decoration. In place of this conventional decorative feature he makes use only of palmette and lotus-bud patterns about the handle.¹

Chachrylion is particularly happy in interior decoration, which in nearly all instances is far superior to the execution of the outside. He follows the Epiktetan school in surrounding the inner field by a band of the natural clay, instead of employing the maeander pattern so popular with Euphronios. In addition, Chachrylion was among the first to introduce a second figure in the interior.² Very likely, earlier examples are to be seen in a cup by Pamphaios³ and in certain cups by Epiktetos.⁴ So far as composition is concerned, our master is quite successful and is able to handle a number of figures in a group with a fair amount of ease. He succeeds in gaining a natural effect, and in producing in the spectator the feeling that his sole interest is not merely in filling space. He possesses all the faults, too, of his contemporaries, such as the careless rendering of extremities. In fact he is a very representative painter of his period.

The dates of Chachrylion's activity are determined by means of the *καλός*-names employed and a consideration of his style. On his signed vases two *καλός*-names are used, Leagros and Memnon. Hartwig is of the opinion that the use of the *καλός*-name for any one person may in general be limited to a period of ten years, owing to the form of the inscription which frequently occurs, namely, *ὁ παῖς καλός*. The *καλός*-name probably refers to some popular youth of the day brought before the public eye by successes in the palaestra. To be mentioned as a *παῖς καλός* a youth was very likely between seventeen and twenty years of age.⁵ Hartwig⁶ has laid down certain principles in regard to these *καλός*-names which are generally accepted: first, that all vases bearing the same *καλός*-name and by the same master are contemporary within ten years; second, that all vases bearing the same *καλός*-

¹ Hartwig, p. 61.

² Walters, II, p. 425.

³ *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, pl. D, 5.

⁴ Louvre G 7; Br. Mus. E 137, E 38.

⁵ Walters, I, p. 404.

⁶ Hartwig, p. 7.

name and by different masters are contemporary within ten years; third, that the occurrence of two or more *καλός*-names on the same vase shows that the two persons mentioned must be contemporary within ten years; and fourth, that all vases with the same *καλός*-name can be linked together by their style, whether they are the work of one or more artists. The same name does not appear on a man's earliest and latest vases.¹

Leagros, the *καλός*-name used on both Chachrylion's and Euphronios's vases, is identified as the Athenian strategos who fell in battle against the Edones in 467 B.C. If we assume that the average age of a strategos would be about fifty years, he would have been a *παῖς καλός* about 500-490 B.C., and we have a round number within ten years for the vases bearing his name. To allow for the development of Chachrylion's style and for the fact that he is a more archaic master than Euphronios, who uses the same *καλός*-name, we would place the beginning of our master's career at about 510 B.C. The other *καλός*-name, Memnon, belongs to the earliest work of Chachrylion, as is shown not only by the inferiority of the workmanship in the vases bearing this name, but by the fact that this name is used by only one other artist, Chelis, who is closely affiliated with Epiktetos.²

It is true that there are distinct stylistic differences in Chachrylion's work, but is it not permissible that an artist should grow and develop during his activity? Does anyone question the paintings of Raphael because they bear witness to the influence of various masters? Certainly not, because in that case there is authentic evidence, which is lacking in the case of our vase-painter. Nevertheless we are justified in believing that the slight stylistic variations observable in the work of Chachrylion are merely due to the extended period of his productivity. Moreover, the stylistic differences in Chachrylion's handling are not of major importance and seem no more marked than in the case of Epiktetos, Phintias, and Douris. The general types remain the same on all of his cups, and the differences that can be pointed out, it seems to me, are no more than could well be expected from a painter of the transitional period, who had been subjected to the influence of such divergent styles as those of his teacher, Epiktetos, and of his pupil, Euphronios, the first great artist of the Strong Style.

¹ Walters, I, p. 404.

² Hoppin, I, p. 183; Walters, II, pp. 277-278.

The two vases of Chachrylion in the British Museum (E 40 and E 41) are generally attributed to the same hand, though Beazley¹ considers that these two, with the cup in Rome² show considerable resemblance to the work of Oltos. I fail to see any very striking similarity, for though both the vases of Oltos have a quadriga such as appears on the British Museum vase (E 41) and though the four horses on each of Oltos's vases are handled in identically the same fashion, they do not resemble the horses on Chachrylion's vase, for Chachrylion has treated them as if they appeared in two planes with the two horses nearest the spectator shown one behind the other, similar in position and outline save that the second projects slightly beyond the first. The same is true of the two far horses, which are shown in the second plane standing somewhat behind the others. Oltos, on the other hand, has used three planes, giving a separate one to each of the nearer horses, so that their heads are in entirely different positions and much more realistically placed. This freedom in the treatment of the heads is not carried out in the rest of the bodies, for Oltos has not handled the legs and tails as well as Chachrylion, who has grouped the legs carefully, indicating details of muscles; and in the case of manes and tails has used short strokes along the edges to indicate hair, whereas the tails of Oltos's horses only have a few short parallel strokes near the bottom. Oltos's vases also show richer ornamentation: the running palmette pattern appears below the exterior design of the vase; and in addition the garments show a profusion of detail in circles, dots, and more elaborate decorative patterns, which do not occur in Chachrylion's work.

On the other hand, the two London vases of our master, while alike in treatment, are totally different in details, showing as many variations as occur on almost all of Chachrylion's other vases combined; a fact which helps us to realize how many differences in style may legitimately belong to the work of one master.

I shall point out these differences later in discussing the style of Chachrylion. In regard to the individual vases, I propose to treat them chronologically so far as possible, grouping separately the early vases, the later vases, and those which I consider experimental, or too fragmentary to be judged adequately.

¹ Beazley, p. 12.

² Noël des Vergers, *L'Étrurie et les Étrusques*, pl. 37.

THE SIGNED VASES

A. *Early Vases*

I. Boston 95.33. Hoppin, I, no. 4, p. 150.

The decoration of this vase consists of a single figure of a dancing Maenad on the interior. The Maenad is dancing toward the left with the left knee bent almost at a right angle. The muscles of the calf of the leg and of the left hip are very prominent. Her head faces the right, though she is advancing to the left, and in her hands she holds castanets. She wears a short-sleeved garment which hangs from the neck to the ankles, and over her back is a panther skin with the paws fastened together across her breast. A narrow, dark border serves as decoration near the bottom of her skirt and a number of heavy, parallel folds are arranged to hang between the bent knees. Small crosses are scattered over the drapery by way of decoration. The execution of this figure shows the greatest care in all details except the hands and feet. The fingers holding the castanets overlap and intermingle in a confusing manner. The Maenad's hair is long and hangs down her back, while two stringy curls fall over the right shoulder, and short wavy strokes are used about the face. The hair is bound by a single fillet and she wears an earring. The outline of the head is incised. The same theme occurs on many vases of the period.¹ This is the vase which Beazley attributes to the "Hermaios Painter."² The inscription is complete +A+PVVION ΕΓΟΙΕΣΕΝ.

II. Louvre G 35. Hoppin, I, no. 10, p. 161.

Hartwig states that this is a plate and not a kylix, but from the appearance of the vase, it is apparent that it is really the center of a kylix cut down, as Hoppin states.³ On the inside is an Amazon armed with bow and arrows, and battle axe. She is a tall figure in the costume of an Asiatic archer, advancing to the right with great strides, and holding the long-handled battle axe in her right hand, with the head of the axe hanging toward the ground. In her left hand, extended in front of her, she holds two arrows with the points upward, and over the left forearm hangs her bow. The short-sleeved chiton is bound in at the waist and hangs in numerous folds around the hips,

¹ Hartwig, p. 33.

² Beazley, p. 14.

³ Hoppin, I, p. 161, n. 1.

very much like that of the dancing Maenad (no. I), with the same narrow black stripe for decoration; and the same rather prominent muscles in the hip and calf of the leg are to be noted. She wears anaxyrides to the ankles, and these are decorated with ellipses and circles having dots in the center. Her headdress is the pointed Thracian cap, with a piece hanging down the back and two ends over the front of the shoulder, falling one on either side of the ear. Short parallel strokes mark the outline of the hair about the face. The figure is slender and there is no attempt to accentuate the breasts. In fact Chachrylion does not differentiate women from men in this respect. Her costume resembles that of Antiope on the London vase (no. XII). The right hand is disproportionately small and the left hand is missing altogether. I am inclined to disagree with Hartwig, who assigns this vase to the best period of Chachrylion's work, for the figure is taller and slimmer than is the case in his later work, and finds its closest analogy in the figures of Epiktetos, particularly his representation of the same subject (Br. Mus. E 135), which shows an archer similarly clad save that in place of the loose chiton she wears a close-fitting waist decorated with dots and eyes in the same fashion as the anaxyrides. The position of this archer is much like Chachrylion's, but she advances to the left and looks back over her left shoulder. The striking agreement of the two figures is to be observed in the slender proportions, the well-defined form of hip and thigh, the treatment of the eye, and the carefully rendered features. The inscription is +A+PVVION EPCIESEN.

III. Louvre. Hoppin, I, no. 15, p. 169.

This vase is decorated only on the interior, as is the case with the two previous ones. Here we see a nude warrior running toward the right. The chest is full-front, the rest of the body in profile. He wears a helmet with a high crest, pushed well back on the head. The right arm is bent at the elbow and in the hand he holds a spear. One can almost feel that the arm is swinging as he runs. On the left arm he carries a pelta, held out in front of him in such a way that the arm and the inside of the shield are visible, in a manner similar to the eye kylix of Epiktetos (Br. Mus. E 3). He also wears greaves. The hair projects high over the forehead from beneath the helmet and is outlined about the face and neck by parallel strokes, somewhat wavy. Short

strokes, by means of thin glaze, on the edge of the jaw indicate a slight growth of beard. The figure is slender, with hips almost straight, as is frequently seen in the work of Chachrylion, but the muscles of the thigh and upper arm are well developed. Two hooked lines indicate the collar bones. The right foot is very awkwardly drawn. The toes, which alone rest on the ground, are too long for the rest of the foot, though some attempt at foreshortening is noticeable in the drawing. The left foot shows additional details, such as the indication of the ankle bone and the large toe nail, an unusual detail in the work of our master. The features are well defined and firmly drawn. The inscription around the field is +A+PVVION E·OIE<EN.

Whereas most of Chachrylion's vases were found in Italy, this one was discovered in a broken condition at Velanideza, in Attica, never having gone far from the place of manufacture.¹ It has the additional advantage of not having been subjected to re-painting.

IV. Rome. Torlonia Museum, Trastevere. Hoppin, I, no. 16, p. 170.

So far we have been describing kylixes with interior decoration only. This vase is an example with exterior decoration as well.

Interior. On the inside is a warrior ready to engage in action. He wears a high-crested helmet pulled down over his face with only the eye showing; also a little hair extends below the helmet at the neck. The warrior is running to the right with long strides, while the upper portion of the body is seen full-front and he looks backward over his right shoulder. Strangely enough he carries his shield on the right arm and the lance in his left hand. In fact, the position is curiously twisted and this alone would be sufficient to indicate the early date of the execution; for either the artist has reversed the whole figure at the waist, and has then attempted to rectify his mistake by marking the breast lines on the youth's back, or else he has interchanged the arms, putting the right arm in the place of the left. The shield is large and round, with a dancing Seilenos in the center. The warrior wears a cuirass with the lower part of the chiton, arranged in many folds, hanging below it. The inscription is +A+PVV[IO]N . . . E-<EN, retrograde.

¹ Rayet and Collignon, *Histoire de la céramique grecque*, p. 178.

Exterior A. Scenes of the palaestra form the exterior decoration on both sides. On this side are four youths, three entirely nude and the fourth one wearing the himation. The draped figure is playing flutes and the position of the hands with the widely separated fingers resembles the flute player on the London vase (no. XIII). He advances to the right and is draped except for the right arm and shoulder. One end of the drapery is thrown over the left shoulder and hangs down behind. The other falls in heavy folds over the left arm, ending in two triangular points. In front of him a nude youth holding a discus is advancing to the left, and back of the flute player another nude youth, who holds a staff and advances to the right, is turning around toward his companion at the extreme left of the composition. All wear their hair short.

Exterior B. On this side the palaestra scene has six figures instead of four. In the center two nude youths are wrestling. The left-hand figure rests his head on the left shoulder of the other wrestler, in such a way as to hide all of his opponent's head except the nose, the mouth, and a small portion of the forehead. The wrestlers grasp each other about the waist with the nearer arms, while in the space between the two figures the other two arms are seen overlapping, with the elbows bent and the hands clenched. They place their weight on the forward feet and merely rest the toes of the back feet on the ground. To the right of the central group stands a draped man with the left hand resting on his hip; in the raised right hand he holds a stick. He faces the wrestlers and seems to be the umpire of the match. His left hand, though covered by the drapery, is indicated by a circular line like that of the dancing figure on side B of the London vase E 40 (no. XIII). To the left is another nude youth watching the contest and possibly waiting for his own turn. On the extreme left are two additional figures: a nude boy holding a laurel wreath in his outstretched hand is being crowned by a bearded man in a long himation with the folds arranged in the same manner as that of the flute player on the opposite side. The action of the figures is not good and the workmanship is careless. The inscription on this side is MEMNON KAVOΣ. This *καλός*-name connects the vase with Chelis, who is the only other worker to use Memnon.¹ He belongs to the early period of the Epiktetan Cycle,

¹ Walters, II, p. 278; Hoppin, I, p. 183.

and, as the same *καλός*-name is only used for ten years, the vase must belong to the early period of Chachrylion's work. This probably accounts for its inferiority.

This is the vase which Beazley thinks resembles the work of Oltos.¹ Again I am forced to take exception, for the figures of the two artists are so unlike that it is useless to try to compare them. The only two figures that show any resemblance are the running warrior on the interior of the Corneto vase and the warrior on the interior of our vase. Here the similarity is merely one of occupation, for they are clothed quite differently. In the Oltos vase the helmet is worn high on the head, while our warrior has his helmet pulled down, concealing his whole face, so that here again we are unable to detect stylistic peculiarities.

V. Louvre G 36. Hoppin, I, no. 11, p. 162.

Interior. A nude youth is playing ball. He is striding to the right, but looking back to the left over his right shoulder. In the right hand, extended behind him, he holds a large ball. His left arm is extended in front of him and bent at the elbow, with the hand hanging down very straight and stiff almost at right angles to the upper arm. He wears his hair short and wreathed with a garland of leaves. The contour of the head is marked by a reserved line of the natural red clay. The collar bones, breast bones, and abdominal muscles are indicated by glaze, but have been repainted. The face is quite badly damaged and certain parts of the arm, the right shoulder, and the legs have been done over. In the field is a circular inscription in red letters, +A+ . . . ON ΕΓΟ Hoppin omits the ΕΓΟ from the inscription.

Exterior A. On side A, between the handle palmettes, is a scene showing the crowning of a victorious youth. There are three figures on this side. In the center facing right is the nude youth who has been victorious. Under his right arm he holds a staff. He wears his hair short and on his head is a wreath of leaves. In his left hand he has the victor's palm branch. Before him in the ground a palm tree is growing. This figure is entirely restored except for the lower part of the legs, the end of the stick, and the left hand. On either side of him stands a youth entirely draped in a long himation except for one

¹ Beazley, p. 12.

shoulder and arm. Each youth rests one hand on his hip while with the other he holds an end of the tape, which is seen passing beneath the foot of the victor, seeming to indicate that his triumph was gained in the foot race. The figure on the right has an end of the himation thrown across the body and outward at an oblique angle, falling in a stiff point beyond the figure in a manner that is characteristic of Chachrylion. These two youths also wear wreaths and the contour of their heads is incised. The inscription is $\text{HO } \Gamma \cdot \text{I} \varsigma \text{ KAVO} \varsigma$ (Hoppin reads $\text{KA} \cdot \text{O} \cdot$ for $\text{KAVO} \varsigma$), and $\text{NE} \Delta \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{O} \varsigma, \cdot \cdot \text{VO} \varsigma, \text{KAVO} \varsigma$ all retrograde. Klein reads falsely $\text{MEMNON KAVO} \varsigma$.¹

Exterior B. On this side are seen the ablutions in the palaestra. Two nude youths, one on either side of a marble basin with a high foot, are washing their hands and arms. They wear wreaths and the outline of the hair is incised. There is an attempt to foreshorten the shoulders as the figures are seen in profile, but it is far from successful, making them appear almost hunchbacked. There are two other nude youths in the scene. One advances to the left, but turns back to the right to look at his companion and point at something with the right hand. The other arm is held up close to his head. The arms are partially restored. The fourth youth is at the extreme right, also nude, and faces the right with the head slightly bent. His right hand hangs by his side. His left arm is extended and encroaches on the palmette design. The inscription is $\text{HO } \Gamma \text{A} \text{I} \varsigma \text{ KAVO} \varsigma$ retrograde $\text{NE} \Delta \text{IA}$ retrograde, $\text{KAVO} \varsigma$. Klein reads one $\text{KAVO} \varsigma$ too many.²

This vase seems clearly to belong with the earlier productions of our master, for it shows decided stiffness and lacks the freedom of his later compositions. The figure on the interior is too largely restored for us to comment with any certainty on the modelling or drawing of the body, but it is quite obvious that the figure is too large for the allotted space, and looks cramped.

The composition of exterior A shows the most care. The three figures standing between palmettes are allowed sufficient space, and are not placed with such symmetrical exactness as to make them seem stiff. On the other side, however, one notices several faults that would not be likely to appear in the later work. The figure at the extreme right is quite insignificant and seems to have been added as an after-

¹ Pottier, II, p. 141.

² Hoppin, I, p. 162.

thought, in a space that is obviously cramped. Consequently this youth is made smaller than the others and his extended left hand overlaps the field of the palmette. In the palmette designs, as well, a certain carelessness is apparent.

In addition to these indications of earlier date, this vase also shows striking similarity to the vase in Rome already described (no. IV). The proportions of the figures on the two vases are much alike with their rather small waists, broad shoulders, and well-defined hips and thighs.

VI. Louvre G 37. Fragments. Hoppin, I, no. 12, p. 165.

Interior. Once more we find a favorite subject, a nude youth in a palaestra scene. He advances to the right, but is looking to the left. His right arm is extended behind him and with both hands he holds a javelin in position to hurl it. Behind him is a tall pole planted in the ground and lying near it is a pick-axe. The youth wears his hair short, marked off from the face and neck by short parallel strokes. The hair is long over the forehead and is wreathed. The chest, which is seen full-front, is unusually broad for the lower part of the body, and the calves of the legs are much too slender for the thighs. The hands and feet show very careless workmanship, as is generally the case with our master. The collar bones are marked by two hooked lines and the breast bones by two deeply curved lines, starting in the middle of the chest and extending half way across the upper arm. The inscription around the field is +A+PVVIO. EΓOIESEN.

Exterior. This portion of the vase has practically disappeared. One sees only the hand of a person holding a lance toward the ground and traces of the hoof of a horse. In the field is a single letter A, part of an inscription.

VII. Louvre G 37. Fragment. Hoppin, I, no. 14, p. 168.

The portion of the interior which remains shows the upper part of a youth half reclining on a banquet couch. He faces left and rests his left elbow on a cushion, which has three black stripes for decoration. Apparently the figure was draped from the waist down, but only the left half of the upper body to the hip, the head, and the right shoulder remain. The right arm, though gone, seems from the position of the shoulder to have been raised. The hair is short and encircled with a

wreath of large leaves, which are drawn more realistically than is usual in the work of Chachrylion. The contour of the hair is incised and marked about the face with scallops. According to Pottier one letter of the inscription remains, +, but Hoppin gives +A, to be restored +A+PVVION.

This vase is inferior in style to Chachrylion's other one with the same subject, which is in the Museo Bocchi at Adria (no. VIII). It is very much stiffer in position and, while the figure does not sit absolutely upright, still it does not actually lean against the pillow, but is like a body without any weight. This is perhaps the earliest instance of a reclining figure showing the chest in a full-front position, though it is found somewhat later, represented in this fashion, in the work of Douris and Euthymides. But in spite of the new position, the figure lacks the grace and freedom even of Epiktetos's figure of a similar subject, a man reclining and singing, in the British Museum (E 37); and it can only be placed with our master's early work.

B. *Later Vases*

VIII. Adria, Museo Bocchi 199, Fragment. Hoppin, I, no. 1, p. 146.

On the interior a bearded man, wreathed, sits on a banquet couch playing kottabos. A portion of the kottabos-stand is visible at the feet of the player. He is draped from the waist to the ankles, and leans against a long pillow, which is doubled over to gain a more realistic effect and decorated with black stripes, each having a narrow black line on either side. The pillow has, as additional ornament, a round tassel at each end. Part of the drapery falls down behind the couch and is visible below it. The man holds a kylix by the foot in his left hand, which is unusually well drawn, while the right hand is held up in front of his face and is balancing another kylix with the forefinger thrust through the handle. The whole body is seen in profile facing the right. There is an attempt to foreshorten the shoulder, which is fairly successful, though it gives a somewhat round-shouldered appearance. The hair is set off from the background by a strip of the natural clay. The treatment of the subject is very much in the manner of Epiktetos in the "Lyre Player" (Br. Mus. E 37) but Chachrylion has drawn the feet with more care, even representing the large toe nail of the left foot, and the drapery falls more naturally than on the

earlier vases. In fact, there seems a decided advance in composition and technique which warrants the attribution of this and the following vases to a later period of Chachrylion's career. The inscription is not complete. Only the PV of +A+PVVION and the OI of ΕΓΟΙΕΣΕΝ remain.

IX. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum. Hoppin, I, no. 5, p. 151.

On the inside of this kylix a bearded Komast is dancing and shaking castanets in both hands, much in the manner of the dancing Maenad of the earlier vase (no. I). He dances to the right with long strides, and the bent knees are quite naturally rendered. His head faces the same direction as his body, making the position far more natural than that of the Maenad. The left arm is stretched out in front of him and over it hangs a flute case. The figure is nude, except for some drapery which hangs down the back, falling in two stiff ends over the shoulders, but this is arranged in such a way that it leaves the chest and abdomen entirely exposed. The drapery is schematically drawn in stiff, parallel folds, the edge being represented by two scallopy lines, which are not so angular as is sometimes the case in Chachrylion's work. The details of the muscles, marked by black glaze, are well rendered, with a good deal of naturalism, particularly the knee cap and lower leg. The hands are poorly drawn and are much too small, with the fingers not indicated at all. The muscles of the abdomen, the line of the breast bone, and the collar bones are all marked. The contour of the hair is not incised, but is indicated by a narrow strip of the clay ground. The inscription is complete, +A+PVVION ΕΓΟΙΕΣΕΝ.

X. Berlin 2267. Hoppin, I, no. 3, p. 149.

On the inside of this vase is a Seilenos balancing a kantharos on his back. It is one of the finest of Chachrylion's works and surely shows the influence of Euphronios in the splendid proportions of the figure and in the anatomical details. The Seilenos faces the left and is bending over at the hips, with the right foot well forward and the left one back. The left arm, slightly extended, hangs down in front of him, and the right arm, bent at the elbow, is held up back of his head. The figure is perfectly balanced in the fashion of a tight-rope walker, resting lightly on his toes. A ground line is represented on this vase, as

on the London kylix (no. XII, Br. Mus. E 41). It is shown by a strip of the natural clay beneath the feet of the figure. The whole body of the Seilenos is seen in profile, splendidly foreshortened. He is heavily bearded and the hair is worn in a mass down the back with two additional twisted curls, and a wreath of small leaves encircling the head. The contour of the head is not incised, but a narrow strip of clay forms the outline, and short parallel strokes are marked about the face. In the rendering of the details of muscles there is great similarity to the Komast just described (no. IX). They are done with the same care and marked with the same black glaze. The hands are quite poor, as in the Cambridge vase. The fingers bend backward, with stubby ends and no indication of joints. Much more care has been taken in drawing the feet than is generally the case, for the right foot is well arched and even the big toe nail is indicated. The inscription is +A . PVVION ΕΓΟΙΕΣΕ.

XI. Museo Greco-Etrusco, Florence. Hoppin, I, no. 6, p. 152.

Interior. This is a particularly interesting vase and seems to me to be Chachrylion's masterpiece. The interior shows Eros flying over the sea — a scene suggesting the Eros *ὑπερπόντιος* of Sophocles (*Antigone* 785, Jebb). Very likely this subject is original with Chachrylion.¹ At any rate it is among the earliest examples of the use of this subject. Beazley² mentions some other examples on vases of contemporary date, such as Oltos's Palermo cup and a fragment in the Boston Museum (10.219). Eros is seen with his head and limbs in profile, but with the torso full-front. He is flying to the right. In the left hand he holds the stem of a tall lily. The right arm is held close by his side with the elbow bent. The legs are bent upward at the knees in order to make them fit into the circle. The wings are very large and are seen in profile, whereas the body is full-front, making the position an awkward and unnatural one. The lower portion of the wings is made to look like feathers by having a strip of the black glaze and a narrow strip of the red clay alternate along the edge. The hair hangs long to the neck and is bound by a single fillet. The contour is scalloped and marked by a reserved line of the clay, and it is set off from the face by short strokes of black glaze. The hands and feet show the usual

¹ Harrison and MacColl, p. 16.

² Beazley, p. 7.

carelessness, and the ear is set much too low, nearly opposite the mouth. The sea below the flying figure is represented by a wavy line. The inscription is $\text{HO } \Gamma\Lambda \cdot \varsigma \text{ KAVO}\varsigma$. Hoppin gives Λ for Λ .

Exterior A. On both sides are depicted the deeds of Theseus, three events on each side. In the center on side A Theseus is shown wrestling with the Minotaur. The Minotaur is being forced to the ground and appears in a full-front position with the right leg bent under him and the other leg extended along the ground to the right. A portion of the head and right shoulder is missing. To the left of the center Theseus is fastening Sinis to his pine tree. Theseus faces the right but looks back to the left, and with his left arm is pulling the pine tree down over his shoulder, while with the right hand he grasps Sinis by the shoulder. Sinis has been forced to the ground and has his right arm about the tree. The face of Sinis is missing, as well as a portion of his body and some of Theseus's right leg. To the right of the center is depicted the third of the series, Theseus forcing Procrustes to lie on his own bed. Theseus is advancing to the bed from behind and holds a two-edged axe in his hand with which to chop off the overhanging limbs of Procrustes. Procrustes half reclines on the bed, supported on his left elbow. He faces the left, but the torso and left leg to the knee are seen full-front. The lower portion of the left leg from the knee down is bent backward and foreshortened so as not to be visible at all. The muscular details in the abdomen are realistically rendered. Procrustes has a long beard which hangs down on his chest in a stiff point. The lower side is outlined by long parallel strokes. His hair is long and is bound by a double fillet tied in a bow with hanging ends at the back of the head. Theseus's hair is arranged in various ways. In one case it is long and bound by a fillet, in another it is arranged in two "buns" behind, with the fillet passing between these. The inscription is somewhat confused in Hoppin's version and should read $\text{KAV} \cdot \varsigma + \Lambda + \text{PV} \dots \text{EPOIE}\varsigma \text{EN EPOE}\varsigma \text{EN}$.¹

Exterior B. On this side in the center Theseus is wrestling with Kerkyon. The action of the figures is good. Kerkyon grasps Theseus about the waist and is forcing his head against the chest of his adversary. Theseus leans over Kerkyon's head with his hands clasped about his opponent's body ready to throw him. Both figures are seen en-

¹ *Bull. d. Inst.*, LIV, 1882, p. 238.

tirely in profile, with the weight thrown on the forward foot and resting only the toes of the other foot on the ground. In the case of both figures there is an attempt to foreshorten the back foot. To the left of the center Theseus is throwing the robber, Skiron, into the sea. The entire back of Theseus is visible, very broad of shoulder and narrow at the waist, with details carefully noted, especially the shoulder blades and spine. His head is seen in profile to the left. With the right hand he holds Skiron by the foot, and with the left hand he is seizing him by the thigh and forcing him over the rock. Skiron is in a position extremely difficult to portray. He is shown upside down, with the body full-front and the head in profile to the right. His left leg is hooked over the top of the rock, and with his left arm he is also clinging to it. The muscular details of the abdomen are practically the same as in the case of Procrustes on the other side. Skiron's lips are slightly parted, and the eye-ball is represented by a round circle with a dot in the center, an attempt to give an expression of terror by means of widely opened eyes. He is heavily bearded and has long hair which resembles that of Procrustes. To the right of the center Theseus captures the Marathonian Bull. The bull, with head full-front, gallops to the right, much in the manner of a rocking horse, supported as it is on the hind feet with the front ones curved in the air. Theseus is behind the bull and is grasping its left horn with his right hand, thus showing a side view of his shoulder. There is the usual attempt to foreshorten here, with very poor success. Theseus's hair is represented with a good deal of variety, but in much the same fashion as on the opposite side of the vase. The figure of Theseus is somewhat stockier than many of Chachrylion's figures, and the hips and thighs are quite heavy in comparison to the lower leg. The closest analogy is seen on the Roman Vase (no. IV) side A, where we have the two nude wrestlers previously described. They have the same sturdy bodies with heavy thighs and hips, and in position they are quite similar to the wrestlers on this vase, but they lack a certain freedom of movement that is apparent in this more mature work of our master. The composition is splendid, with fine feeling for action. It is the most ambitious of any in the number of figures and subjects involved. Practically the whole space is filled, but it does not look crowded, in spite of the overlapping of numerous legs and feet. The inscription is +A+PVVION . . OE-

≤EN . . . NAIOS≤. Hoppin reads part of the inscription on side B as if it appeared on side A. Harrison restores it +A+PVVION ΕΓΟΙΕ≤EN ΑΘΕΝΑΙΟΣ≤ ΚΑΥΟΣ≤. If NAIOS≤ may be restored ΑΘΕΝΑΙΟΣ≤ the nationality or at least the adopted land of Chachrylion is proved.¹ This is uncertain evidence at best but is partially substantiated by the fact that the name, Chachrylion, itself seems to show no trace of foreign derivation. However, no other person by the same name appears in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, which goes to prove that the name is at least a very unusual one in Greece, so that there seems to be no solution of the problem whether our master is an Athenian by birth or adoption.

XII. London. British Museum E 41. Hoppin, I, no. 8, p. 157.

Interior. This has the distinction of being the only signed vase where Chachrylion has attempted a second figure in the interior. The ground line is also represented, which, taken with the use of the second figure and the careful workmanship, is ample proof that this vase belongs with the best work of our master, and to the period when he was strongly influenced by Euphronios, who frequently used the second figure. Here we have a youth playing a lyre and a maiden standing by him. Possibly it is the meeting of Theseus and Ariadne. Pausanias² says that on the chest of Cypselus was shown "Theseus holding a lyre, and near him Ariadne holding a crown in her hand." This fits the description except for the crown, but that is not complete, and as a matter of fact a careful examination of the vase itself shows definitely that the object is not a crown, but what it is I am unable to determine owing to the incomplete state of preservation. It is possibly a lotus flower held upside down. The inscription on the inside, +ΑΙΠΕ≤V, would seem to indicate that it is a scene of everyday life.³ The youth wears his hair long and wreathed. He is draped in a long himation, with the right arm and shoulder bare. A part of the himation is thrown over the left shoulder, hanging down his back halfway between hip and knee. Two other ends hang over the left arm, terminated by points and tassels. The limbs beneath the drapery are

¹ Harrison and MacColl, p. 16.

² Paus. V, 19, 1.

³ Harrison and Verrall, *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, London, 1890, cxxiii-cxxiv.

clearly outlined. He holds the lyre in his left hand and the right hand is extended as if he had just taken his fingers off the strings, while a cord attached to the lyre is also held in this hand. He faces the right toward the maiden, with the head and the whole body in profile.

Ariadne, so-called, has her hair done in a single knot, bound with a fillet, and wears earrings. The hair is surrounded by a reserved line. Both arms hang down near her sides, but in her right hand she holds a lotus flower (?) and with her left hand she is holding up the hem of her skirt much in the manner of some of the archaic "Maidens" on the Acropolis. She wears a long chiton with a mantle over it, decorated around the neck with a key pattern. She also wears a bracelet and sandals. The fillet, sandal straps, and bracelet are all marked by purplish-colored paint. In this figure as well, the outline of the limbs is noted beneath the drapery. A black, decorative band near the bottom of the maiden's garment recalls the Maenad on the vase in the Boston Museum (no. I). In the field is the inscription +ΑΙΡΕ ΣΥ.

Exterior A. Theseus carrying off Antiope is the subject of this side. At the left Theseus steps into a quadriga, holding in his right hand the reins and whip, while with his left hand he encircles the waist of Antiope, who is kneeling in the chariot, but is facing in the opposite direction, leaning out over the arm of Theseus toward two fully armed, bearded warriors on the right. In her extended arm she holds her bow. Her costume is the regular Phrygian dress, pointed cap, surrounded with a wreath, short, close-fitting tunic decorated with zigzags, and anaxyrides ornamented with eyes set vertically. Theseus wears his hair long and wreathed. He is clad in a cuirass and greaves, with a mantle thrown over his right shoulder. The two warriors to the right are fully armed with cuirass, greaves, and helmet. The foremost, Perithoös, carries a round shield and two spears, while Phorbas, who turns his head back to the right, wears a sword and carries a spear. The warriors' costumes are elaborately decorated with fringe and zigzag patterns. They both wear their hair long beneath the helmets, but Perithoös has his in stringy curls, while Phorbas's hair is worn in a heavy mass with two long curls in front of the shoulder. In both cases the hair projects high over the forehead through the opening of the helmet. The feet of all the figures are rendered with far more regard for the truth than in the early work.

The horses of the chariot hold their heads very high. They are stiff and the legs are too long, but the rendering of the muscles in the legs is quite successful. Some attempt to gain perspective has been made by representing the two forward horses in one plane, and the two farthest from the spectator standing somewhat nearer the chariot, giving the effect of a second plane. The inscriptions are $V\Sigma$ retrograde, ANTIOΓEIA , ΓEPIΘO\Sigma retrograde, ΦOPBA\Sigma retrograde.

Exterior B. On this side are seen two nude boys on horseback, and between them a draped maiden and a youth conversing. The youth on the left is draped in a long himation which is arranged like that of the youth in the interior, save that the end of the himation falls away from the shoulder at an angle more like that of the dancing man with the drinking horn on the other London vase (no. XIII). The youth is leaning on a knotted staff which he holds in his right hand. The left arm, bent at the elbow, is extended in front of him in a gesturing attitude. His weight is thrown on the right foot and the left leg is bent. He faces the right toward the maiden, who wears a long chiton, himation, bracelets, and sandals. The bracelet on her right arm, the straps of the sandals, and the flower which she holds in her left hand are all indicated by faint purplish paint. Her right hand is extended with the palm outward toward the youth, having the same long, stiff, and jointless fingers that we have already noted on the vase in Rome (no. IV) and in the case of the Ball Player of the Louvre vase (no. V). The arrangement of the drapery is formal, falling in numerous folds, indicated along the edge by two parallel zigzag lines, with the usual black band appearing near the hem of the skirt. The head and shoulders of the man are missing and the upper part of the head and left shoulder of the woman as well. On either side of the central figures are the two short-haired boys on horse-back facing the center. They hold the reins in one hand and the switch over the other shoulder. The horses are like those on the opposite side, and are very large in comparison to the size of the boys. The conventional ornamentation is elaborate on this vase. There is a large, well-drawn palmette on either side of the handle, connecting with a smaller one within the handle itself. Then in addition, from each main palmette a lotus flower branches off, making four altogether, but one differs somewhat from the others in that it represents a bud rather than an open flower. The inscription on this side of the vase is $+A+$ · $V\Lambda ION$ retrograde.

XIII. London. British Museum E 40. Hoppin, I, no. 7, p. 155.

Interior. An Amazon armed with helmet, cuirass, and greaves is advancing to the left. On the left arm she carries a pelta, which has as a device two quail feeding. These are black-figured with incised lines for details, and they are separated from each other by a vertical band of crenellated pattern. In the right hand the Amazon holds a couched spear. The helmet has a very high crest with a tail piece hanging down to her waist, and is of a different shape from those worn by the warriors on the previous vase, for this helmet is not meant to be pulled down over the face. It must be a creation of the artist's imagination, as it does not conform to any of the usual types of helmets. It is neither Attic nor Corinthian and has neither movable cheek pieces nor a nose piece. The Amazon's hair projects beneath it over her forehead and is marked by short parallel strokes; also four stringy curls fall down her back. She wears an earring which ends in a cross. Beneath the cuirass appears a short, close-fitting chiton decorated with a border and dots of black. The head of the figure is rather too large for the rest of the body, but the features are firm and well rounded. The eye is represented by a circle and dot, as in the case of Skiron on the Florentine vase (no. XI). The inscription is +A+PVVION EΓOIE-ΣEN retrograde.

Exterior A. Dionysos, bearded, wreathed, and wearing a long chiton, advances to the right, holding a drinking horn in his extended left hand and an ivy branch in his right. He looks over his right shoulder toward a dancing Seilenos in the rear. The drapery is heavy and falls in numerous parallel folds and has the narrow black band near the bottom which we have remarked before. One end of the drapery is thrown over the right arm of Dionysos and falls in triangular points at an oblique angle. The hair is long, with two extra locks falling in front of the shoulder. No moustache is represented, though Dionysos wears a heavy beard with short parallel strokes on the under side. The Seilenos dances to the right with the left arm stretched out and the hand open, palm upward. The chest is seen full-front, marked by two curved lines meeting in the middle and the nipples are indicated by dots. The hair is wreathed and arranged in a manner similar to that of Dionysos, except that it is marked off from the face by scallops instead of parallel lines. The head is also treated like that of Dionysos

and the moustache is drawn straight across the upper lip, turning down at the corner and tapering to a point where it meets the beard. To the right of Dionysos is a dancing Maenad with castanets. She resembles the other dancing Maenad (no. I), but does not wear the chiton bound in at the waist; the hip, therefore, is not so strongly accentuated, but the same black band is seen near the hem of the skirt. The panther skin is fastened across her breast in the same fashion and she wears snake bracelets on her arms. Her hair is arranged in a knot high at the back of her head and bound by a fillet tied in a bow with hanging ends. Her ear is placed too low, nearly opposite the mouth, and is not so good as that of the dancing maiden on the other side of this vase. The front of the heads of all these figures is damaged, so that it is impossible to carry the comparison further.

Exterior B. In the center is a girl wearing a long himation and playing flutes. Her fingers are spread as she holds the flutes like those of the man on the vase at Rome (no. IV). She is advancing to the right. The drapery is heavy, one end being thrown over the left shoulder, exposing the right shoulder and arm, which show a short-sleeved chiton fastened at intervals over the top of the arm. Her hair hangs down in her neck and is wreathed with ivy. Back of the flute player a bearded, wreathed man advances, with a drinking horn in his right hand. Both hands are extended before him to the right. The lower portion of his body is nude, but a small mantle surrounds his hips, with the ends drawn up under the arms and thrown over the shoulders so that they hang down behind at a decided angle. To the right of the flute player is a dancing youth (or maiden?) enveloped completely in a long himation. He is dancing to the left. The hands are entirely covered beneath the folds of the garment and one is represented by a spiral. The upper portion of this figure is largely destroyed. Purple is used for the headdresses, ivy leaves, inscription, and for the Seilenos's tail. Incised lines are used for the contour of all the heads. The faces on this side are all missing and the face of the Maenad on the other side likewise. The feet are not so well rendered as on the other London vase, just described, being done more in Chachrylion's early manner, but the freedom of the composition and the vigor and movement of the figures, combined with the carefully drawn palmettes about the handle, all convince me that this is one of the later vases.

The palmettes are even more elaborate than on the other London vase (no. XII), for three palmettes are grouped on either side of the handle, joining one beneath the handle, and at the right of side B an extra bud is added, which may possibly be modern.¹

XIV. Palermo. Museo Nazionale. Hoppin, I, no. 9, p. 160.

Interior. A nude, beardless warrior, armed with greaves, helmet and shield, is facing the right. A sheathed sword hangs from his left side, and in his right hand extended behind him he held a lance; however, most of the arm and the lance are missing. The helmet is pushed well back on the head, so that the hair is seen projecting far over the forehead through the opening of the nose piece. Beneath the helmet hang many stringy curls down the back and in front of the right shoulder. The warrior has his knees slightly bent and is leaning forward, resting his shield on the ground. The most interesting thing about this vase is the way in which the shield is drawn. Instead of giving a profile view showing only one edge, the artist has represented both the nearer and the farther edge. According to Hartwig² this is the first attempt to show both edges in perspective. The attempt is not successful, for instead of representing the two edges by lines curving in opposite directions, the lines curve in the same direction meeting in points at the top and bottom of the shield. A portion of a horse in black glaze is seen on the outside of the shield. The breast bone and the collar bones of the warrior are marked, but the other anatomical details are only slightly indicated. Thin glaze marks the beard on the side of the cheek. The inscription is +Α ON ΚΑΛΟΣ which at first sight would seem to be a *καλός*-name, but from a consideration of the style, Hartwig thinks that the artist intended to write ΕΓΟΙΕΣΕΝ.³ Whether or not Chachrylion meant to write *ἐποίησεν* in place of *καλός*, I heartily agree with Hartwig that the style is sufficient to prove its author. The warrior is strikingly like the running warrior on the Louvre vase (no. III). Both are young men, nude save for greaves. They both wear helmets pushed well back on their heads and in both cases the hair over the forehead projects through the nose-opening of the helmet. Both figures are similar in proportions, and have strongly defined chins with a slight growth

¹ *Br. Mus. Cat. Vases*, III, p. 65.

² Hartwig, p. 22.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

of beard represented. Though ἐποίησεν does not appear, there are other vases of our master where his name stands alone without a verb, such as the British Museum vase (no. XII).

Exterior A and B. A komos scene with three youths is represented on both sides. The figures are all similar, nude youths with a narrow piece of drapery thrown over one shoulder or else held in the hands. Two hold drinking horns and all are dancing. They wear the hair short and wreathed with laurel. The contour of the hair is incised with a scalloped edge. The chins of the figures are well rounded, and the hips and thighs are emphasized, as in most of Chachrylion's figures. This vase resembles the earlier Roman vase (no. IV) in the treatment of the bodies, but is freer in composition and much more successful in the rendering of action, which, with the advanced attempt to draw the shield in perspective, makes it reasonable to class this with the later work. Parts of the vase have been destroyed, so that on side A part of the head of the figure to the extreme left is missing, as well as the left hand of the right figure and parts of the arms of the central figure. On side B portions of all the bodies are wanting. The central figure lacks a head, while the figure on the left is without the lower portion of the face. This is one of the few vases to have the conventional ornamentation. Palmettes are found about the handles, one beneath and one on either side. In contrast to the other vases they are not connected by a continuous line, but are all drawn separately. In addition there is a single maeander pattern about the outside beneath the feet of the figures. Hoppin and Hartwig do not agree as to the inscriptions of this vase, but a careful examination of the reproduction in Hartwig (Pl. I) shows that errors have been made by both. The remaining letters are

Interior — +Α ON ΚΑΥΟΣ.

Exterior A — HO .ΑΙΣ . . . Ο . ΕΔΙΑ ΝΑΙΧΙ ΚΑΥΟΣ, to be restored HO ΓΑΙΣ ΚΑΥΟΣ ΝΕΔΙΑ ΝΑΙΧΙ ΚΑΥΟΣ.

Exterior B — .ΛΥΟΣ HO ΓΑΙΣ . . ΙΧΙ .ΛΥΟΣ . . . ΟΣ, to be restored ΚΑΥΟΣ HO ΓΑΙΣ ΝΑΙΧΙ ΚΑΥΟΣ ΚΑΥΟΣ.

This concludes the series of vases which may with some degree of certainty be listed as early and later work. The seven vases which remain are not easy to place definitely. Of these, numbers XV and XVI of our list I consider to be experimental attempts to solve the

problem of foreshortening. Number XVIII is too fragmentary for consideration, number XIX is fragmentary and inaccessible. Numbers XVII and XX are both lost, but Hartwig has preserved some fairly adequate drawings of number XVII, though such a large part of the drawing is due to restoration that it is difficult to tell what are the original parts. Number XXI I do not consider to be the work of Chachrylion for reasons which I shall point out later.

C. Experimental, Fragmentary, and Inaccessible Vases

XV. Louvre G 38. Hoppin, I, no. 13, p. 167.

Interior. The scene on the interior of this vase is quite unusual. The subject is not new, but the position and the foreshortening of the figure are clearly an attempt of our master to solve a difficult problem. The scene represents a nude youth of a short, muscular type scraping himself with a strigil, an Apoxyomenos. The youth is seen from the back with the head twisted to the side in such a way that only the eye and the upper portion of the face are visible over the left shoulder. The right arm is not visible at all, but from the position of the shoulder it is evident that the arm passes across the front of the body, and that he is holding the strigil in that hand. The hand holding the strigil and a portion of the left arm are destroyed. The youth is twisted into a most unnatural position, and the lines of the body are sharply defined, almost angular. The right foot and leg are seen in profile, but the left leg, on which the weight is placed, is seen entirely from the back, in a foreshortened position, so that only the heel is visible with a small portion of the side of the foot. Fine lines indicate the anatomical details, namely, the line of the shoulder blades, the spine, the outline of the hip, the back of the knee, and the bulge of the muscles in the calf of the leg. Our master has a fair idea of the anatomy of the human form, but on the whole the representation is a very clumsy one. The left hand, which is shown palm outward, reveals the typical carelessness of the artist in the treatment of extremities. The fingers are much too long and stiff, while the thumb is too small. To the right of the figure a column of small diameter is seen, and to the left the cast-off garments of the youth are heaped up in a stiff manner on a step or low platform. The hair is rendered in a solid heavy mass, with the outline incised, and with projecting parallel locks

about the face done with a heavier brush than is generally the case. The ear, too, is unusually large. Obviously the artist's interest is in the problem of foreshortening.¹ He works on the same problem on other vases, particularly the Florentine kylix (no. XI) in the figure of Skiron. The inscription is +Α+·Vv·ON ΕΓΟΙΕΣΕ·. Hartwig wrongly gives the Α in a different form, namely Λ. The letters are round and fat as if a heavy brush had been used and in this respect they resemble the letters seen on certain vases in the Louvre, numbers V and VI of our list, and on the Florentine vase (no. XI).²

Exterior A. This side is in a rather fragmentary condition. The scene consists of three figures: the central one, of which very little more than the feet remain, is standing on a three-stepped platform, facing the right, and is draped. To the right is a draped figure complete, save for the head. This one appears in three-quarters back view with the right hand resting on the hip. The left hand is extended slightly below the level of the waist. The figure is draped in a long himation save for the right shoulder and arm. The figure on the left, draped from the waist down, is in a most awkward position. The head and most of the left side have been destroyed. He is advancing to the left with knees bent, so that the left knee nearly touches the ground. The chest is seen full-front and the right arm, bent at the elbow and wrist, in the form of a letter "Z," is extended to the left. Hartwig and Pottier both interpret it as a concert scene, assuming that the middle figure on the platform is playing some kind of a musical instrument. Such a subject is not uncommon, but appears on vases of the black-figured and red-figured periods.³ The Antaios krater of Euphronios shows a similar subject where the performer is mounting the platform with his flutes, but the three listeners are all seated. Hartwig thinks the figure on the left is applauding the performance, an interpretation which seems to me to be somewhat forced. Owing to the similarity of the pose to the dancing Maenad on the vase in Boston (no. I), I should say that this is a dancer accompanied by the musician on the platform. The proportions of these figures are very poor, for Chachrylion has not been able to disregard the primitive idea of isocephalism, so the dancing figure is represented just as high as the figure standing on the platform, making him much too large in comparison. A single letter (Α) remains

¹ Hartwig, p. 25.

² *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 27, no. 2.

of the inscription, according to Hartwig, though Hoppin gives no inscriptions on the exterior in spite of the fact that an OΣ is visible in the reproduction of side A, and no letter Α can be discovered.

Exterior B. On this side are preserved the lower parts of three draped figures, probably youths, who are conversing. The figure on the left is visible from the waist down and must have been bending slightly forward. He holds a staff in the left hand. The figure in the middle turns toward the third youth, who holds a knotted stick and faces the center. Directly back of him at the right appears what seems to be the base of a column or part of a doorway. Hartwig's interpretation differs somewhat from Pottier's, just given. He says that the central figure, owing to the fact that the feet are placed together, must be playing a flute or a lyre, and that the right-hand figure is seated.¹ He apparently thinks that the structural material at the right is part of a bench. As a matter of fact one guess is as good as another, for from the remaining fragment, it is impossible to interpret the subject with certainty.

XVI. Syracuse 21198. Fragment. Hoppin, I, no. 17, p. 173.

The interior shows a nude youth of heavy proportions grooming a horse. The youth is seen from the back with the head turned, so that the upper portion of the face is visible over the left shoulder in a manner similar to the interior figure of number XV. The horse, facing right, stands with the left forefoot raised and with his head turned so that it is visible full-front. The horse is tied to a hitching post at the extreme right of the picture. The proportions of the composition are very strange. The back of the horse is only on a level with the waist of the youth, and the outline of the horse's back and belly is visible through the youth's body according to the picture in Hoppin, which is incorrect.² His head is on a level with the horse's head and is wreathed. The hair is short, the contour being marked

¹ Hartwig, pp. 26-27.

² In the summer of 1923 I saw and examined this vase at Syracuse, and it surprised me to find the workmanship far finer than I had been led to expect from the drawing in Hoppin. I was unable to detect any lines of the horse's body drawn across the boy's back. Throughout the lines are drawn with vigor and spirit, and, in spite of a certain lack of anatomical knowledge on the part of the artist, it is the work of no timid person.

with scallops and a reserved line. Anatomical details are freely indicated in the youth's legs, hips, and back. The feet are greatly foreshortened, since they are seen from the back, very little more than the heels appearing. Wavy strokes mark the horse's mane and tail, and the lower part of the tail is looped up and tied. The eyes of the horse are perfectly round, with a black dot in the center, and various details of the face are marked. The execution is somewhat inferior to that of the other vases, a heavy brush being used for wreath, lettering, and certain details, much in the manner of the Apoxyomenos (no. XV). In fact in the position of the head and the left leg, the Apoxyomenos closely resembles this figure. Perrot¹ inclines to believe this to be an ancient forgery on account of the poor workmanship, but Hoppin thinks that in spite of the faulty proportions, the difference in execution is no more marked than in the case of other painters.² Orsi³ assigns it to the early period of our master, because of the disproportion between horse and man, the hesitating execution of the nude body, and the inaccurate anatomical details. The outlines of the body are surely and firmly drawn and the position is so much like that of the Apoxyomenos, while the horse's head recalls the Marathonian Bull on the Florentine vase (no. XI), that I can see no reason for Perrot's statement that it is an ancient forgery. Moreover, I do not agree with Orsi that it is an early work, for the horse and youth stand on a ground line, which does not appear on the early vases, and the attempt at realism is very marked. The horse does not stand on all fours, but lifts the left forefoot, and with head cocked on one side looks naïvely at the spectator. To be sure, the workmanship is inferior to that of many other vases, but Chachrylion has here paid more attention to foreshortening than to accuracy of proportions. The inscription, although partly missing, still preserves a portion of each letter, +A+PVVION EPOIESE.

XVII. Lost. Hoppin, I, no. 18, p. 175.

Interior. A Seilenos with heavy beard and long hair, wreathed, advances to the right with the left leg raised high in the air. He is carrying a wine skin in the left hand and a drinking horn in the right. The

¹ Perrot and Chipiez, X, p. 380, n. 1.

² Hoppin, I, p. 173, n. 1.

³ Orsi, *Mon. Ant. Linc.* 1907, p. 458.

collar bones are marked by two large hooked lines. The breast bones are also indicated, and the nipples marked by two small circles. The hair is marked off from the face and neck by scallops, which are also seen along the upper side of the beard, while the lower side is indicated by short parallel strokes as in the case of Procrustes and Skiron on the Florentine vase. The eye is very small and the eyebrow and moustache are heavy. The inscription is complete +A+PVVION EΓOIE-SEN.

Exterior A. No adequate illustration of this vase exists, but an outline drawing indicates that the vase has been much broken and restored. The upper portion of the woman holding a club is restored, also the upper portion of the nude youth holding a sword, the arms of the person back of him, and the upper portion of the figure at the extreme right. The only figure that is almost complete is that of a bearded man, whose hair is long and has numerous curly locks hanging about the face. He is draped in an himation, and has fallen to the ground with the right knee bent under him and the left arm extended above him. The proportions of the man are large in comparison to the other figures, suggesting a possible interpretation as a battle between Theseus or Herakles and a Giant. Hartwig,¹ however, thinks it is the murder of Aegisthus by Orestes. He thinks the figure at the extreme left is Clytemnestra, and the figure immediately behind Orestes is a slave, while the figure to the extreme right is Electra assisting her brother. The large size of Aegisthus would not prevent this interpretation, for a fallen or kneeling figure is generally made larger than the others at this period in order to keep the upper line of the composition on the same level, as, for instance, in the Concert Scene on the vase in the Louvre (no. XV). The inscription is VEAΛ · OΣ . . . OΣ. The use of this *καλός*-name connects it with Euphronios and places it among the later works of Chachrylion, though we should be unable to determine the period on stylistic grounds alone.

Exterior B. This side is greatly restored also. The original parts are the lower portions of four warriors, a kneeling, helmeted figure with a sword, sacrificing what seems to be a lamb, and the upper portions of two other warriors, one having a lance and a round shield, with his helmet pulled down over his face, and the other with the hel-

¹ Hartwig, p. 30.

met pushed back, showing wavy locks of hair falling over the shoulder. The latter is leaning over in the act of sacrificing some animal which is restored as a pig. Hartwig does not attempt to interpret it, as nothing is certain beyond the fact that it is a combat of armed warriors. There is no inscription on this side.

XVIII. Athens, Acropolis Museum. Hoppin, I, no. 2, p. 148.

This is the only one of the vases which is not a kylix or a portion of a kylix. It is a flat plate in such a fragmentary condition that there is no published reproduction of it and it has no stylistic value. All that remains is a hand and a basket, with part of the inscription +PVVI for +A+PVVION ΕΓΟΙΕΣΕΝ.

XIX. Petrograd, Russian Archaeological Society. Fragmentary. Hoppin, I, no. 15 *bis*, p. 169.

Hoppin tells us there are probably no exterior pictures on this kylix, and he states that the interior up to the medallion, and the exterior are covered with a brilliant orange slip like the Geryon kylix of Euphronios. The interior shows a youth with a horse. The inscription is +A[P]V[VION] retrograde E[ΓΟΙΕΣΕΝ].

XX. Lost. Fragment. Hoppin I, no. 19, p. 176.

This is merely a fragment of the foot of a kylix with the inscription [+A+]PVVION ΕΓΟΙΕΣ[ΕΝ].¹

XXI. British Museum. 97.10-28.2. *Br. Documents*, 1898, vol. 71, p. 59, no. 5. Hoppin I, no. 8 *bis*, pp. 158-159. *J. H. S.* 1921, p. 120, fig. 3, p. 121.

This vase does not belong to any of the groups so far considered, for I cannot believe that it is the work of Chachrylion, nor indeed, even from his workshop, in spite of the fact that it is so listed by the British Museum Guide and by Hoppin.

The vase is in a rather fragmentary condition. On the inside is an archer wearing a Corinthian helmet ornamented with horns and a high crest, which is outlined by red clay and filled in with black glaze.

¹ Hoppin (I, no. 19 *bis*, p. 176) includes with the vases of Chachrylion a reference to the Geryon kylix of Euphronios, which was made by Chachrylion and probably painted by Euphronios in the shop of our master. I shall omit it, as it properly belongs with the vases of Euphronios.

Only the head, shoulders, a portion of the left arm, and a hand holding an arrow remain. The youth wears his hair long. It is marked off from the tail-piece of the helmet by a scalloped edge and reserved line. It projects high over the forehead through the nose piece of the helmet and is outlined against the face and neck by slender curly locks. The inscription reads . . . VΛ . N EN, according to Hoppin, but in an examination of the vase itself, I was unable to detect more than three letters of the artist's name V . I . N.

Exterior A. On this side a procession was represented, of which parts of three figures remain. One is nearly complete, but only one foot and leg of the other two are left. The preserved figure is that of a draped youth advancing to the right and looking back to the left with head slightly bent. He is draped in a long himation exposing his chest and part of his abdomen, with muscles depicted in a most detailed manner as if actually exposed to view. His right arm is extended behind him and he holds a portion of a staff. An end of drapery hangs over the raised left arm and in this hand the lower part of flutes may be detected. The garment of the youth is ornamented at intervals with crosses and is arranged with parallel folds across the chest and over the arm, falling in a point. The youth wears his hair short, with short strokes about the face. The inscription . . \VOΣ remains.

Exterior B. From this side two fragments are preserved, representing a sacrifice. The smaller shows a profile view of the face and the left side of a man's torso. Part of the left hand is visible holding some fruit. On the larger fragment the right shoulder and arm of a woman may be seen. She holds a perforated bowl above the flames of an altar and advancing toward the altar from the left is a man. The left shoulder, part of the chest and arm are the only visible parts. He is carrying a basket which contains an offering. Above the altar is part of an inscription in two lines OΣ, KA Walters (*J. H. S.* 1921, p. 121) states that this must be Λέαγρ]ος κα[λός, since Leagros is the only καλός-name used by Chachrylion which ends in ος. This statement is not convincing owing to the fact, first, that the vase is not proved to be the work of Chachrylion, and second, that the inscription might easily be καλός, καλός, with no indication of the name intended to be coupled with the complimentary adjective.

The portion of an inscription on the inside, given above, by no

means makes the restoration to Chachrylion certain, though I am unable to suggest any other name which would fit the case. However, the treatment of the hair on the interior with its long, wavy, parallel locks is unlike any figure on Chachrylion's vases. The helmet, too, with the horns, is of an entirely different shape. Above all, the widely opened eye with its large pupil finds no parallel on the other vases, and the continuous alternating lotus and palmette pattern around the exterior of the vase is much too ambitious for our master. In view of the discrepancies in the style of this vase and the uncertainty of the inscription the attribution to Chachrylion seems unwarranted.

THE STYLE OF CHACHRYLION

A discussion of style must, of course, be based entirely on those vases which bear the artist's signature. It is quite evident already that there are numerous variations in the style of Chachrylion, making it impossible to formulate characteristics which are maintained throughout, but in general the same characteristics appear and the differences are not more marked than might well be expected from a transitional worker. By considering the matter of style at this point and fixing in our minds the conspicuous features of Chachrylion's work, it will be easier, then, to discuss the attributed vases with some degree of certainty.

Hair. The hair is treated as a solid mass, marked off from the background either by scallops, leaving a narrow strip of the natural clay between, or else by incision. Around the face and neck a fringe of short parallel lines is frequently seen or else scallops are used, and there are frequently stringy curls in addition to the mass. The female figures generally wear the hair arranged on top of the head, but the Maenad on the vase in Boston (no. I) wears hers long, with two curls hanging in front of the shoulder. There are numerous ways of arranging the hair and often many different methods appear on the same vase. The Theseus vase in Florence (no. XI) shows a number of arrangements and if so many different ways may be used for the same figure and on the same vase, we are not surprised to find such great variety in the work of the same master. Five times on this vase Theseus wears his hair bound by a fillet. In one case the fillet is tied with hanging ends, in one case the hair is entirely unbound. There are

two instances of the hair fastened up at the back of the head in two "buns" with the fillet passing between, and in the other representations of Theseus the hair is worn long in a heavy mass down the back, marked off from the clay ground by scallops and a reserved line with short parallel strokes about the face and neck. In all representations of Theseus the hair projects high over the forehead, but the hair of Procrustes does not project nearly so far and in addition he is the only figure in which the hair is bound by a double fillet tied in a bow with loops hanging down behind. Moreover, Eros, on the interior, does not wear his hair projecting over the forehead at all.

These variations observable on the same vase give some idea of how difficult and next to impossible it is to point out any one feature, and say definitely that this is a prominent characteristic of Chachrylion. All we can do is to give the characteristics that generally occur and, by studying these in combination, and by familiarizing ourselves with the actual vases so far as possible, to arrive finally at some degree of certainty.

Eyebrows. These are marked by a delicate line, generally arched, but sometimes nearly straight. It usually stops short of the nose.

Eyes. The eyes are generally almond shaped with a black dot in the center, but the round circle with a dot also occurs. They are always seen full-front or nearly so. On the Theseus vase in Florence (no. XI) no two are drawn exactly alike (Fig. I).

Nose. The line of the nose, except in the case of satyrs, is a continuation of the forehead without any indentation, making a long slanting line, as the forehead generally recedes somewhat. The nostrils are either not marked at all beyond the mere outline of the face or are indicated by a fine curved line at the corner.

Mouth. The mouth is indicated by a short straight line or by one curving downward slightly at the corner. The mouth of Skiron is shown with the lips parted (no. XI).

Chin. The chin is firm and well rounded, showing an indentation in the outline and a distinct outward curve beneath the lower lip. Sometimes the line is broken beneath the lip by a short projecting line (Fig. II).

Ears. The ears are never well done, and the size and position vary. They are generally placed too low on the head and are indicated by



I. From Harrison and MacColl, pl. X.



V. From Harrison and MacColl, pl. X.



II. *a* and *b* from Harrison and MacColl, pl. X;
c, from Rayet and Collignon, p. 175.



VI. From Harrison and MacColl, pl. X.



III. From *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, II, pl. VII, 2.



VII. From Harrison and MacColl, pl. X, and
Wiener Vorlegeblätter, II, pl. VII, 2.



IV. From Rayet and Collignon, p. 175.



VIII. From Harrison and MacColl, pl. X.

only a few lines. The lobe is round and much too large. Sometimes the ear is omitted entirely with only a space left by the encircling hair, as in the case of Procrustes (no. XI).

Beards. The beard is treated as a solid black mass, very heavy over the cheeks and gradually diminishing to a point. It may be quite short or may hang down over the chest, but it is always pointed and stiff. The upper line is smooth, while the lower side shows a fringe of short parallel lines (Fig. III). The moustache is indicated by a line almost straight beneath the nose and curving down abruptly at the corner of the mouth. The line may be fine or heavy, but is apt to taper to a point where it joins the beard.

Neck. The neck is generally short and thick, due to the inability of the artist to foreshorten the shoulders. The collar bones are frequently represented full-front when the face is in profile, by two lines with hooked ends turned downward (Fig. IV). The hook varies in size and is frequently not so large as in Fig. IV. The position of the hooked lines varies as well as the shape.

Torso, Front View. The chest is seen full-front and is very broad. The breast muscles are marked by curved lines, as seen in Figs. III, IV, V. The nipples are indicated by dots, or by circles, or are omitted entirely. The abdominal muscles are sometimes indicated by a series of four circles with adjoining edges. The waist is narrow in proportion to the breadth of the chest. The hips are indicated by a circular line curving upward (Fig. V).

Back, Full View. The shoulders are seen in full-front position and are broad. The shoulder blades are marked by curving lines, the upper one being a continuation of the line of the arm (Fig. VI). The spine is marked by a single straight line which joins the curved line of the hip.

Profile View. When the whole body is seen in profile there is an attempt to foreshorten the shoulders, which is more or less successful, but is apt to give a very round-shouldered appearance. In such cases the neck is quite short and thick. Some details of muscles may be rendered as in the other views of the body, but the collar bones and breast bones are omitted. The Seilenos balancing a kantharos (no. X) shows anatomical details in the abdomen, arms, and legs, but often only the line of the hip is indicated.

Arms. The arms on the whole are good, the contour line of the muscles being well rounded above and below the elbow. Frequently when the elbow is bent, the line of the lower arm is extended to mark the crease (Fig. VI). The wrists are apt to be small.

Hands. The hands are consistently poor throughout. The fingers are too long for the rest of the hand, often being as much as two thirds of the entire length. They are jointless, with stubby ends, and they sometimes bend backward. The finger nails are not indicated (Fig. VII).

Legs. The legs are rather short, with heavy thighs. The lower leg is often too small in proportion to the upper part. The contour of the leg is good. Very few details are indicated and often nothing besides the outline. When the ankle is marked, it is by means of a curved line slightly hooked (Fig. VIII).

Feet. The feet, like the hands, are entirely out of proportion. They are long and "floppy," with the toes often taking up more than a third of the entire length. The toe nails are very seldom indicated. The foot is usually not flat on the bottom, but has a decided arch, which appears too near the heel. There are two instances of the foot seen from the rear and greatly foreshortened (nos. XV and XVI). Frequently the figures are seen standing firmly on the forward foot, with only the toes of the other foot resting on the ground. In these cases there is an attempt to foreshorten the back foot. There is no instance of a foot seen full-front.

Drapery. The drapery is stiff and mannered. The folds are represented by parallel lines, the lower edge of the folds being marked in a zigzag fashion. The drapery is apt to have a heavy appearance with a great many folds. One of the chief characteristics of Chachrylion is the throwing of the ends of a garment over the arm or the shoulder, so that they hang down in two stiff triangular points that stand out from the body, often at an oblique angle. These points frequently end in two small round balls, which probably represent weights used in daily life to hold the garments in place. The folds around the neck are also rendered by parallel lines, generally three in number, but in a circular arrangement. The border of the garment is marked, sometimes by two parallel lines in zigzags or by a single line. The form beneath the garments is occasionally outlined, not to make the

drapery seem thin and transparent, but apparently because the artist is afraid to leave the form beneath to the spectator's imagination. The decoration of the drapery, where it occurs, is of a simple nature. It is well represented on the London vase (no. XII). On the interior a key pattern is marked in an irregular manner about the neck of Ariadne's robe. On the exterior of the same vase the clothing of Antiope is decorated in a conventional fashion. The anaxyrides are covered by a pattern of eyes, and the upper portion is decorated with a zigzag pattern. The zigzags also appear on the warriors' costumes. Frequently, too, a black stripe near the bottom of the himation serves as decoration, as in the case of the Maenad (no. I).

Wreaths. These are usually of ivy in a stiff conventional arrangement, with triangular leaves placed opposite each other on either side of the stem.

Fillet. The fillet may be single or double. It is sometimes plain, but often is tied in a bow at the back of the head with hanging ends. It is always narrow.

Ornamentation. There is no ornamentation on the interior of the vases, only a single line of the natural clay marks the field of the medallion. On the exterior no eyes or animals appear beside the handles for decoration, such as are common on the vases of the archaic period. There are a few vases where palmette patterns appear around the handles, sometimes combined with lotus buds or other flowers, as on the two vases in the British Museum (nos. XII and XIII). Only seven vases show decorative patterns of any sort, namely IV, V, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, and XXI, the last of which I believe should be excluded from our list. In most of these cases the palmette groups around the handles are made into a continuous design, but in the Palermo kylix (no. XIV) they are treated separately, one on either side of the handle and one beneath it. As a general rule the use of palmettes is a sign of early work, as the tendency seems to be to abandon them as the red-figured period advances, but as a matter of fact, they occur more frequently on Chachrylion's later vases than on the early ones. This is not surprising, as he belongs to the transitional period, and one sometimes sees, even in the work of Euphronios and Douris, the palmettes appearing beside the handles.

In general the figures of Chachrylion are well proportioned, short, and stocky, but are much more slender in his early work while he is still under the influence of Epiktetos. He is fairly successful in conveying a feeling of life and action by means of his figures, though of course it is far from being realistic. The laws of composition are well understood. At no time does one feel that he is merely trying to fill space. The figures are not crowded, and on the other hand they do not appear as separate, isolated figures, but are well balanced, so that the eye follows easily from one to another. Chachrylion makes no attempt to render landscape, but certain devices are used to give local color, such as a tree or a rock.

Inscriptions. The letters of the inscriptions are round and fat. The form employed agrees throughout with the Attic letters which are prevalent between 510 and 480 B.C.¹

CHACHRYLION'S CONNECTION WITH OTHER MASTERS

Chachrylion stands midway between Epiktetos and Euphronios, though with strong leanings toward the earlier school. By means of the *καλός*-names it has been possible to date his vases approximately without reference to style, for the use of the name Memnon links him with the Epiktetan Cycle and connects him with Chelis, a far more archaic master than Chachrylion. We have seen, too, that Chachrylion uses Leagros and that Euphronios and Euxitheos make use of this *καλός*-name as well.

Oltos acted as painter for Euxitheos,² and as Euxitheos uses the *καλός*-name, Leagros, we have a roundabout connection established between Chachrylion and Oltos, which is borne out to a certain extent in the vases. Evidently Oltos worked at about the same period as Chachrylion, and, as in the case of the latter, must have used this *καλός*-name toward the close of his career, for Leagros properly belongs to the Euphronian Cycle. Oltos's vase in Berlin (2264) shows certain similarities to the London vase (no. XII). The quadriga, though much inferior in drawing to the quadriga of Chachrylion's vase, yet is more like his work than that of any other master of the period; while the warriors on the interior recall the figures of Perithoös and

¹ Roberts, *Gr. Epigraphy*, pp. 106-107.

² Hoppin, II, p. 247.

Phorbas on Chachrylion's vase (no. XII). The greatest similarity is seen in the palmettes around the handles, which have additional lotus buds and flowers, just as on this London vase.

No connection can be established between the work of Euthymides and our master, for although Euthymides was affiliated at the beginning of his activity with the Epiktetan Cycle, he is far more advanced in drawing and composition than Chachrylion. A glance at his vases with their sturdy figures, admirable proportions, accurate anatomical details, and daring foreshortening, shows that he ranks close to Euphronios.

Phintias, too, who is closely allied to Euthymides, is on the whole more advanced than Chachrylion, but one of his vases (Athens CC. 1157), showing a young crouching warrior on the interior, at once recalls Chachrylion's Palermo vase from the drawing of the shield which shows both edges in profile. This was one of Chachrylion's more advanced productions.

Chachrylion's vases, however, show striking similarities to the works of Epiktetos. We have already noted the likeness between the reclining figures as drawn by the two men. The Lyre Player of Epiktetos is like the Kottabos Player on Chachrylion's vase at Adria (no. VIII), in the foreshortened shoulder, the position of the feet, and the general proportions. The drawing of the arm and the inside of the shield on the Louvre vase of Chachrylion (no. III) is like that of the Satyr on the vase by Epiktetos in the British Museum (E 3). A komos scene on a vase by Epiktetos (Br. Mus. E 37) is somewhat like Chachrylion's similar subject on the Palermo vase (no. XIV). The proportions of the youths are similar, with their slim figures and small heads, but Chachrylion's vase is more advanced both in action and in freedom of positions. Again the Amazon figures of the two masters (Br. Mus. E 135 and no. II of our list), though they differ in costume and position, show striking similarity in proportions, and in the faulty drawing of hands and feet. Both artists neglect to indicate the breasts. Lastly, let us take the Epiktetan vase (Br. Mus. E 136) showing a young warrior and a horse on the interior. At once we think of Chachrylion's vase in Syracuse (no. XVI). Although in this case Chachrylion has attacked the problem of foreshortening in a manner that would never have occurred to Epiktetos, we find the later master maintaining the

same proportions between the horse and the man that had been established by his teacher, namely, that of having the head of the horse and of the man on the same level.

So we conclude that Chachrylion owed his training largely to Epiktetos, but that as time went on, he advanced beyond his teacher, threw off the traditions and conventions of the archaic school, and attempted more difficult problems. He was very likely the teacher of Euphronios, as is evidenced by the Geryon kylix (Munich 2620) painted in his shop; and toward the close of his activity it is evident, in the freedom of his compositions and the greater sturdiness of his figures, that he was influenced in turn by the work of his talented pupil.

THE ATTRIBUTED VASES

In addition to the signed vases, certain others have been attributed to Chachrylion, chiefly on the basis of the *καλός*-names. A vase in Baltimore bearing two *καλός*-names, Leagroś and Epidromos, has been assigned to our master by Hartwig, because the name Leagros appears on the signed works and also because, in his opinion, there are strong stylistic resemblances to the signed work of Chachrylion. If this vase is rightly assigned to our master, then we have a third name to work with, namely, Epidromos. On this ground Hartwig has attributed to Chachrylion eight unsigned vases bearing the name Epidromos, and one which he restores as Epidromos, from the first two letters which remain (ΕΓ). If they are by Chachrylion, they must belong to the later work of our master, owing to the connection with Leagros; and a consideration of the work itself shows a strong influence of Euphronios. In fact, so closely do they resemble the work of the Euphronian Cycle that it is doubtful whether they can possibly be attributed to Chachrylion. But I hope to point out the striking differences in the style by discussing the vases individually. In addition to these eight vases bearing the single *καλός*-name, Epidromos, Hartwig assigns one to Chachrylion merely on stylistic grounds; and still another, not mentioned by Hartwig, is listed by Hoppin,¹ attributed to our master by Pottier. This brings the total number of attributed vases to twelve.

¹ Hoppin, I, no. 24 *bis*, p. 177.

I. Louvre G 40. Hoppin I, no. 24 *bis*, p. 177.

Interior. A youth, half-draped, reclines on a banquet couch facing the left. The chest is seen full-front and the head is turned to the right. The left elbow rests on a striped cushion. In the left hand he holds a kylix, in the outstretched right hand a drinking horn. The right knee is raised, but the legs and feet are entirely covered by the drapery, one end of which, drawn over the raised leg, falls in a point over the front edge of the couch. The hair is short and wreathed and the contour of the head is reserved. The inscription to the left of the figure is merely ΕΓΟΙΕΣΕΝ, with no indication of the artist's name.

Exterior. The exterior is very fragmentary. On one side only two feet of a person walking to the right remain, and practically no traces of the subject on the other side.

Hartwig thinks that this kylix is probably from the hand of Pamphaios owing to the poor drawing. The drawing is careless, but that is hardly a sufficient reason for attributing it to Pamphaios. To begin with, the subject is not a popular one with Pamphaios. Only one example of a reclining figure exists in his work, a fragment showing a Satyr on a couch lifting up an amphora.¹ Moreover, the reclining figure is more common in the work of our master, for we have noted two good examples of this subject (nos. VII and VIII).

I am inclined to follow Pottier in his attribution to Chachrylion,² for the drawing of the collar bones and breast muscles of this figure are much the same as on the Louvre vase (no. VII) signed by Chachrylion, and the drapery, too, is handled in the fashion of our master with a zigzag border, and with the end of the garment thrown across the lap of the youth and hanging down in front of the couch in the characteristic triangular point.

II. Baltimore. Hoppin, I, no. 20, p. 176.

Interior. On the interior of this vase are two figures. A nude youth, facing left, is standing on a two-stepped platform. The chest is seen full-front, with the rest of the body in profile. In the left hand, hanging by his side, he holds a discus bag and in the right he has a

¹ Hoppin, II, p. 307, no. 23.

² *Catalogues des Vases antiques du Louvre*, III, p. 910.

javelin.¹ The boy's hair is short and wreathed with laurel, the contour being indicated by scallops and a reserved line.

On the left side, facing the youth, is the instructor of the palaestra, who is bearded and wreathed with ivy. He is draped in an himation from shoulder to knees, with the right arm and shoulder exposed. The right hand rests upon his hip and in the left hand he holds a staff. The right foot is seen full-front, unlike any on the signed vases, but in a foreshortened position, as in the case of the Apoxyomenos. In respect to the large proportions of this figure and the arrangement of the drapery, it resembles, according to Hartwig, the figure of Aegisthus, so-called (no. XVII), and the head is somewhat like the Krotalist on the Cambridge vase (no. IX). At the foot of the picture a segment of the natural clay represents the ground on which the man stands. Near him is a pickaxe with the handle thrust in the ground, and a discus bag hangs near his head. The interior is in good condition save for a crack extending through the body and head of the youth; portions of the man's right arm also are restored. The hands and feet are more realistic than in the work of Chachrylion. The thumb nail of the man's left hand is well shown, and also the large toe nails of the boy's feet. The inscription reads $\vee\epsilon\alpha\lambda \cdot \omicron\varsigma \cdot \alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$. Hartwig² gives $\epsilon\pi\iota\Delta\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ on the inside as well, but a photograph of the vase fails to show this.

Exterior A. The outside of the vase is in a much more fragmentary condition.³ At the left a bearded man, nude save for a narrow piece of drapery across his back and falling over each arm, advances to the right, with the left hand held up in front of him, and with a stick in the right hand. Next him a youth, wreathed and draped in the same fashion, advances toward him with a skyphos in his outstretched right

¹ In *Arch. Zeit.* 1885, Pl. 19, 2, the loop of the javelin is not shown, and in Hartwig (Fig. 5a) it is represented below the boy's hand instead of above it, as Professor Robinson of Johns Hopkins pointed out in a letter to me, and as is also clear in a picture of the vase in my possession.

² *Jahrb. arch. I.*, VIII, 1893, p. 169.

³ Hartwig says that four of the heads on the outside are gone. He is right in the number, but has listed the wrong ones as missing. The head of the flute player is preserved, the missing ones being those of the maiden on side A, and the three right-hand youths on side B. A photograph of the original shows this to be the case. Both sides show komos scenes with four figures in each.

hand and a hooked staff in his left hand. Beyond him is a wreathed youth playing flutes and advancing to the right. This figure is seen entirely in profile, with the drapery drawn around his back and hanging down in points over the right arm. At the right of the composition is a draped maiden, advancing to the right with a thyrsos in her right hand. This figure is destroyed from the waist up. The inscription according to Hartwig is $\cdot \cdot \Delta \text{POMOS} \cdot \text{AVOS}$, but according to Hoppin the E of Epidromos remains.

Exterior B. On this side is a similar komos scene. A great volute krater rests on the ground, and a wreathed youth advances toward it with a skyphos in his outstretched left hand. He is draped in the fashion of those on the other side. Over his right shoulder he is balancing a jug on a stick which is thrust through the handle. On the other side of the krater three youths are seen advancing toward it. The first two are more scantily draped than the third. The heads of all three are missing. The inscription is $\cdot \text{AVOS}$. The graffito FE appears underneath the foot of the vase.¹

A close study of this vase reveals many points of divergence from the style of our master. These differences are more easily noted in the case of the interior figures, owing to their better preservation. The bearded man has thick lips slightly parted, unlike the signed vases of Chachrylion, for there the lips are never indicated beyond the mere outline. Moreover, the drapery is not handled in the characteristic manner, for the edges are indicated by curving lines in place of the usual rather sharp zigzags. The hands, too, are treated more naturalistically. The youth's first finger overlaps the second as he holds the staff, and the man's closed left hand shows the thumb overlapping the fingers in a realistic manner, with the thumb nail indicated in a way far in advance of Chachrylion. In addition to these points of dissimilarity, the position of the figures is different, for they do not balance properly, but seem to incline backward, giving an appearance of unsteadiness. The most striking difference, however, is found in the foreshortened representation of the man's right foot as seen from the front, a frequent practice in these Epidromos vases, but one which never occurs on Chachrylion's signed vases.

¹ This is not noted by Hartwig.

III. Lost. Hoppin, I, no. 27, p. 178.

On the interior of this vase is a bearded man with his hunting dog. The man faces the front, except for the head, which is seen in profile turned toward the left. He is wreathed and wears the long himation, with the chest and right arm exposed. The end of the himation is thrown over the left shoulder from behind and then passes beneath the left arm, leaving that arm bare to the elbow. The edge of the drapery is bordered by a heavy black band, then a strip of the natural clay, and on the extreme edge a second, narrower black line, but the folds are not arranged in the zigzag manner associated with the work of Chachrylion. There is more swirl to the drapery than is customary with him, and nowhere do we notice a pointed end of drapery so commonly seen on his signed vases. The breast muscles and collar bones are marked by continuous lines, and circles indicate the nipples. The man leans on a knotted stick which is held beneath the left arm, and the right arm is stretched out to the side with the fingers spread. The treatment of the figure greatly resembles the bearded man on the interior of the Baltimore kylix, but is unlike any of the signed works of our master. The left foot is seen full-front in the same manner, and the right foot, placed crosswise behind the other, shows the heel and the toes on either side of the foreshortened foot. The man's dog stands behind him, the head and forelegs being seen on the left of him, and the tail and back legs visible on the right. The animal is treated realistically. The position is a natural one, though the head is slightly too long and thin for the rest of the body. Back of the man, hanging on the wall, is a discus bag. The inscription is ΕΡΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ ΚΑΝΟΣ.

IV. British Museum E 25. Hoppin I, no. 23, p. 177.

On the interior of this vase, within a thin red circle, is a kneeling youth facing the right. The knees are bent, the right one not quite touching the ground, and the left one raised. The right foot is bent so that the weight is thrown on the toes, but both feet are too long and are badly shaped. The youth stretches out his left arm to maintain the balance of the composition. This arm is entirely covered with a mantle, which also conceals the hand, forming a volute where the hand clutches the folds, much like that of the dancing Maenad on the

signed vase of Chachrylion (no. XIII), but this drapery falls in folds which are rounded and quite different from the usual zigzag arrangement on Chachrylion's vases. The rest of the body is nude. The right arm, bent at the elbow, is extended back of the figure, and in this hand the youth holds a knotted staff. His hair is worn short and is wreathed, with parallel strokes about the face and neck, and with the contour scalloped and incised. The muscles are accurately rendered, and seem too skilfully handled to be the work of our master. The details picked out are the collar bones, breast muscles, nipples, forearm muscles, ribs, and abdominal muscles, as well as the muscles of the thigh and knee. Purple is used for the wreath and inscription, while the inner markings are light brown. The inscription is ΕΠΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ ΚΑΥΟΣ ΙΧΙΑΝ (ΝΑΙΧΙ).

The striking differences from Chachrylion's style are the parted lips of the youth; the advanced anatomy; the freedom of the drapery, with its triple border line and curved edges; and the marking of the breast muscles, which show an extra line joining the lower edge of the curves together, unlike anything on the signed vases. It rather resembles a vase signed by Phintias, as maker, and attributed to Euthymides.¹ The position of the legs is much alike on both and the same formula ΚΑΥΟΣ ΝΑΙΧΙ is used on both.

V. Louvre G 112. Hoppin, I, no. 25, p. 177.

The composition on the interior of this vase is exceptionally good. Two figures are seen in the act of sacrificing a pig. At the right is a stone altar, which stands on two steps and has a volute decoration at the corner. Before the altar a youth, nude except for a bit of drapery about the waist and hips, kneels on the right knee with the left leg stretched out in front of him. The entire body is seen in profile. He holds in his hands a pig which is very realistically drawn. The right hand is supporting the animal from beneath, while with the left hand he holds the pig's mouth so that it cannot squeal. The youth's hair is short and is bound by a single fillet. The drapery is decorated by dots in groups of three.

Back of the youth stands a nude, bearded man, facing the altar. In his right hand he holds a large knife, and the left hand is stretched

¹ Hoppin, *Euthymides*², p. 81, n. 1.

out over the altar. On the side of the altar are seen three red streaks meant to indicate blood. The man is wreathed with a laurel crown. At the left side of the picture is a palm tree, conventionally drawn, which shows that the sacrifice is to Apollo. A segment of the red clay at the bottom indicates the ground on which the figures stand, as in the Baltimore kylix. Hartwig says¹ that the extremely careful drawing of both figures finds its closest parallel in the warrior of the Palermo vase (no. XIV) and the London vase (no. XII), but the drawing is even more careful, if anything, than on the two vases referred to. The details of muscles are carefully rendered. In the field above appears ΕΠΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ in red letters, and in the exergue ΚΑΛΟΣ is written with black glaze. The workmanship and the compositional arrangement are so excellent that it is impossible to believe it can be the work of Chachrylion. The reasons for doubting the attribution to our master are as follows: The drapery of the kneeling youth is decorated by a pattern of dots grouped in threes, more elaborate than Chachrylion's patterns; also, the folds are very naturalistic and have curved edges. The ankle bone is marked by an oval instead of a hooked line. The mouth is drawn so that the line at the corner turns down too abruptly. Moreover, the signed vases fail to show such well-balanced compositions and such freedom of arrangement in the handling of two inner figures. Where two figures appear on the interior of the signed works, such as Theseus and Antiope (no. XII), they are placed separately and are stiffly handled; but such is not the case here, nor on the attributed vase in the British Museum (no. VI), where the youth is piercing the falling warrior. These two vases, in the easy grouping of the figures, surely point to an artist of the developed Euphronian Cycle.

VI. British Museum E 43. Hoppin, I, no. 24, p. 177.

A combat between two warriors forms the subject on the interior of this vase. The picture is full of action, and Hartwig² maintains that it is the first attempt to show two figures on the interior closely related in action. One of the warriors is a youth, nude save for a mantle drawn across the chest with the ends thrown back over each shoulder. The youth wears greaves and helmet, and his hair falls below the hel-

¹ Hartwig, p. 48.

² *Ibid.*, p. 50.

met in stringy curls to the shoulder. The helmet has cheek pieces with spiral decorations, and a long crest with zigzags along the edge. He is seen in profile facing the left. In the left hand he holds a scabbard from which he has just drawn his sword. With his right hand he plunges the sword into the abdomen of his adversary, who has been forced to his knees and is shown with the upper portion of the body in a full-front position. The defeated warrior is an older man, bearded and completely armed. The beard is heavy and, owing to the full-front position, is rendered in a different manner than is usual with Chachrylion; that is, it is not pointed as in a profile view, but hangs in a round mass over the chest like a bib, with a fringe of parallel strokes around it. The nose is long and thin, covered by the nose piece of the helmet, which is indicated by two hard black lines. The eyes are merely narrow slits, the upper lid shown by a single line and the lower lid by two lines. The lips are slightly parted, showing the teeth, in an attempt to portray pain and suffering. In this respect it resembles Skiron on the Florentine vase (no. XI), though in that case one merely sees the lips parted with no attempt to indicate teeth. The crest of the helmet is not shown in a foreshortened position from the front, as one would expect, for such drawing was apparently beyond the power of the artist. Instead one sees the crest split in two parts, showing half of it on either side of the warrior's head. He also wears a short-sleeved chiton, that stops above the knees, a cuirass, and greaves, while in the right hand he holds his sword. The shield of the fallen warrior is seen in perspective and has on it, for a device, a conventionalized ivy pattern. Very few details of muscles are indicated in the figures, but the knuckles of the youth's hand are indicated by four small dots. The inscription is ΕΓΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ ΚΑΥΟΣ.

This vase deviates from the style of Chachrylion in many respects. On the signed vases, though we have seen an attempt to portray suffering in the case of Skiron, we have not found the lips or teeth indicated, nor have we noted any attempt to indicate the eyelids, as here, by a double line below the eye. Moreover, the feet are not drawn in Chachrylion's customary fashion. The handling is much more naturalistic than in the work of our master. The right foot of the fallen warrior is bent so that the large toe is turned under, and the toe nail is drawn. The whole effect is quite realistic. The feet are well propor-

tioned; and the ankle bones are indicated by an oval with an additional straight line beside it, whereas the hooked line is characteristic of Chachrylion's vases. Then, too, the drapery is freer, with curved edges and a triple border line. Another unusual feature is the marking of the youth's knuckles by four dots. All these points show the extraordinary divergence of style from the signed vases of our master, and make it impossible to include this vase with his attributed work.

VII. Lost. Hoppin, I, no. 28, p. 178.

As this vase is lost and the illustrations are quite inadequate, it is not possible to come to any definite conclusion regarding it. On the interior is shown a nude youth, wreathed, standing with his back to a stele represented on the left. The body of the youth is shown in profile, with the left foot slightly in advance of the right one. He is leaning forward, with both hands stretched out before him. Gardiner¹ says that this is the position of a runner at the beginning of the race. The lower part of the chest can be seen beneath the raised arms, showing the nipples marked by circles, in spite of the fact that the body is seen in profile, a treatment without parallel on Chachrylion's vases. The hair is worn short and wreathed with laurel, the contour marked by a reserved line and set off from the face and neck by parallel strokes. The hands are poorly drawn, the fingers being jointless and "floppy," but the proportions and drawing of the feet seem better than on Chachrylion's signed vases. The inscription is ΕΠΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ. Wernicke² does not give the Σ of Epidromos. He does not attempt any attribution, but merely comments that in style the vase belongs to the transitional period between the time of Epiktetos and the Strong Style.

VIII. Petrograd. Hoppin, I, no. 26, p. 178.

So far as I know there is no illustration of this vase available; therefore it will be impossible to form any opinion concerning it. The description of the interior varies. Klein says it is a bearded man holding a hare by the ears. Hartwig describes it as a youth holding a hare by the ears, with a dog behind him. Beazley³ says it is a bearded man, leaning on a stick, holding a hare, with his dog behind him. Under

¹ Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports*, 1910, p. 276, Fig. 49.

² *Arch. Zeit.* 1885, p. 290.

³ Hoppin, II, p. 490.

these conditions of disagreement no comparison with the signed works is possible. The inscription is ΕΓΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ ΚΑΥΟΣ.

IX. Brussels. Hoppin, I, no. 22, p. 176; II, p. 490.

Hermes Kriophoros is represented on the interior. The god is shown, heavily bearded, running to the right, but looking back to the left, with the head and legs in profile, and with the chest seen full-front. An ample drapery about the shoulders hangs down in front over both arms, concealing all but the hands, and leaving the larger part of the body exposed. He wears a hat, probably meant to represent the petasos, though it has a turned-up brim.¹ Hermes wears endromides and carries the caduceus in his left hand, while over his shoulders he is carrying a ram held by the feet in the manner of the Moschophoros from the Athenian Acropolis. The drapery is not handled in the fashion of Chachrylion, for the folds are free and naturalistic with curving edges. Moreover, though Hartwig gives the inscription as ΕΓΙΔΡΟΜ . . ΚΑΥΟΣ, this reading is very uncertain, and it is doubtful whether this vase belongs with the Epidromos group. According to the *Élite Céramographique*,² the letters are ΕΠΙΔΡΟ ΚΑΥΟΣ and Panofka³ has ΕΠΙΥΟΣ, which can scarcely be restored ΕΓΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ. The exterior of the vase is very fragmentary, with only traces of three figures in a symposium scene appearing on either side. Hartwig says it is not feasible, owing to the condition of the vase, to make a stylistic comparison of this vase and the characteristic works of Chachrylion.

X. Berlin. Inv. 3239. Hoppin, I, no. 21, p. 176.

Interior. A fleeing Egyptian forms the decoration of the interior. He is made to look like a barbarian, with receding forehead, coarse features, large nose, thick lips, and heavy, prominent jaw. The lines of the face, arms, and right hand are extremely angular. He wears a short chiton, tight at the waist, with round neck and short sleeves.

¹ In the *Él. Cér.* III, Pl. 87, certain letters appear on the hat, given as √Α√√, but Hartwig, p. 45, says these letters are no longer extant. Probably they were never letters in the first place, but merely zigzag marks for decoration, which when partly worn away would appear to be the letters given.

² III, p. 253.

³ Panofka, *Die griechischen Eigennamen mit καλός*, Pl. II, 2.

The man runs to the right with great strides, and looks back to the left. The left hand is raised, with long, flexible fingers bent backward, and the finger nails are indicated by black spots which find no parallel on the vases of Chachrylion. With the right hand he is holding up the drapery of the chiton in order to run more rapidly. The inscription is $\ve\epsilon\alpha\alpha \cdot \omicron\varsigma \epsilon \kappa\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

Exterior. The decoration of the exterior is badly damaged, one side being almost entirely destroyed. Two figures are nearly complete, those of Herakles and an Egyptian to the left of him; a large part also of two other figures, and the feet of three more can be seen. The subject is the battle between Herakles and Busiris. Herakles, clad in the lion skin and chiton, faces the right, and holds a fallen Egyptian by the shoulder, while with his right hand he has raised his sword above his head preparatory to striking down his enemy. The raised arm entirely covers the face of Herakles. His arms are sinewy, and the details of muscles are indicated. To the left of the hero is a bald Egyptian, wreathed, wearing a half-length chiton. He advances to the left, but looks back at Herakles, with his left arm and hand stretched out to the right. The type is similar to the Egyptian on the interior, with the same bald head and barbaric features represented. The heads of the other two figures are very fragmentary, but are probably of the same type. In the field above the combatants, Hartwig reads $\epsilon\Gamma$, which he completes as Epidromos, but Hoppin says that the $\epsilon\Gamma$ of the inscription is modern and therefore Hartwig's reading is incorrect. Furtwängler pointed out this mistake when reviewing Hartwig's book¹ and also discovered the additional letters $\cdot \epsilon\alpha \cdot \cdot \cdot \varsigma$, to be restored Leagros.²

This vase cannot be included with the Epidromos vases, owing to the fact that the inscription $\epsilon\Gamma$ is not original; and in no case could it have been included with the work of Chachrylion. The angular treatment of the arms and hands is very different from anything seen in his work. Moreover, the artist of this vase shows a decided interest in caricature, and has given the faces far more expression than we associate with our master.

¹ *B. P. W.*, 1894, p. 143, note.

² *Arch. Anz.*, 1893, p. 89.

XI. Boston Museum 01.8024. Hoppin, I, no. 3, p. 27.

Interior. On the interior is a nude boy crouching upon a rock, at the right of the picture. The boy faces left and holds a fish pole in his right hand. In the other hand he holds a fish basket. In the water below, indicated by a curving horizon line, may be seen six fish swimming about, and a fish trap is also indicated. Clinging to the lower part of the rock is an octopus. In fact, there is a good deal of local color in the picture. The boy's hair is wreathed and marked off from the face by parallel lines. The contour is incised. The interior is somewhat damaged, for the lower face and shoulders of the figure are missing. The inscription is $\Gamma\Lambda[\text{I}\Sigma \text{KAVO}]\Sigma$.

Exterior. The scenes on either side of the exterior are much alike. Two Seilenoi appear in the space between the palmette patterns. On side A, one is seen dancing to the left, while the other, on the right, is supporting himself by his left hand which rests on the ground, and is holding a drinking horn in his right hand extended behind him. He looks back to the left. The inscription is $\text{EAKEA} < \text{E}$.

On side B, the Seilenos at the right of the composition rests his left knee on the ground, while the right foot is extended in front of him with the heel touching the ground. He faces the left, and is balancing a kantharos. The other faces the right, and is resting his weight upon the right knee and left foot. In his uplifted right hand he holds a stone, while with the extended left hand he holds an amphora by the handle. All the Seilenoi wear the hair long and wreathed, with additional curls over the shoulders. They have long pointed beards also. The inscription is $\text{KPATE}\Sigma \text{EVI O}$.

Hartwig attributes this vase to Chachrylion on stylistic grounds alone, though resemblances to the style of our master are few and far between. There seems to be no reason for giving it to Chachrylion, for even the subject, "a boy fishing," is very different from those generally handled by our master. Hoppin does not include it in his list of attributed vases, and Beazley gives it to the "Ambrosios Painter."

I fail to see in this vase the slightest resemblance to Chachrylion's work. The marking of anatomical details is far too careful for our master, and, moreover, the faces do not seem to bear any of Chachrylion's characteristics. The eyes are somewhat too large, and are, in

three cases, of the circle and dot type, which, while it does occur on the signed vases, is not common. One Seilenos is shown with lips parted, and all have a peculiar expression, difficult to define, but as though the upper lip were drawn upward, wrinkling the nose at the same time. Details are indicated in the palm of one hand, which find no parallel in the work of Chachrylion; and the handling of the shoulder and chest of the right-hand Seilenos, on side A, is most peculiarly out of joint. The boy on the interior is not so different from some that we have seen on the vase in the Louvre (no. V), but the contour of the head is carelessly drawn, and the parallel strokes about the face are much too straggling and uneven to be by Chachrylion's hand. In addition, there is more emphasis on local color than is observable on the signed works. Owing to the careless workmanship and the lack of similarity between the figures of this vase and those of the signed vases of Chachrylion, it seems far more satisfactory to disregard the attribution of Hartwig, and to accept the attribution to the "Ambrosios Painter" who, according to Beazley, "if bad, is never dull, for he fancies curious subjects and he puts his little people into funny poses."

There are two additional vases with the *καλός*-name, Epidromos, both anonymous. These, however, have been attributed to Euphronios by Miss Radford.¹ The Berlin vase (Inv. 3232) was assigned by Hartwig,² as a late work, to Chachrylion, though at the same time he admitted that it is very close in style to the early work of Euphronios.

XII. Berlin Inv. 3232. Hoppin, I, no. 20, p. 407.

Interior. On the interior Herakles and a Seilenos make sacrifice at an altar. Herakles is facing the right and is pouring out the offering, a libation from a kantharos. He wears the lion skin over his head, and over the chiton a long robe decorated with dots in groups of three. The garment falls in curved lines about the feet, and is decorated with a border consisting of two black bands with dots between. His left hand is raised in front of him, palm outward, and with the thumb nail indicated, while in the right hand he holds the kantharos. The knuckles of this hand are indicated by four dots. Behind Herakles is a

¹ *J. H. S.*, XXXV, 1915, pp. 117-118.

² Hartwig, p. 702, and *Arch. Anz.*, 1893, p. 88, no. 32.

kneeling Seilenos, holding the sacrifice over the fire on a pointed stick. Behind him is Herakles's club. The altar is on a two-stepped platform, and has a volute at the corner. The inscription is ΕΓΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ ΚΑΥΟΣ.

Exterior A. Herakles, Hermes, and Kerberos are to be seen on this side. Hermes is at the left, the upper body seen full-front, but the head in profile to the right, and with his left hand raised. In his right hand he holds the caduceus. He wears a hat with turned-up brim, and endromides; also a chiton, and a short mantle buckled across his chest, with the ends hanging down in front over the arms. The edges of the drapery are decidedly curved. Herakles, in the center of the composition, faces left, but with his head turned back toward Kerberos on the right, and with the club raised in his right hand over his head. This part of the vase is somewhat damaged, but Herakles wears the usual lion skin over his short chiton. This falls in many folds, and is decorated near the bottom by a broken line of black, and has a curving edge. Kerberos faces the left, and has snakes attached to his feet and tail. The subject and its treatment recall the Geryon kylix of Euphronios, but this vase seems slightly later in date. The inscription is ΕΓΙΔ.ΟΜΟΣ ΚΑΥΟΣ.

Exterior B. A Seilenos surprises a nude, sleeping Maenad, and cautiously takes hold of her arm and leg. I believe no illustration of this side exists, but Miss Radford tells us that the nude figure of the Maenad recalls the Petrograd psykter of Euphronios with its curving contours and skilful interior lines. The Petrograd psykter (644) is not only signed by Euphronios as painter, but bears the *καλός*-name, Leagros, as well, with which we have noted that Epidromos is connected on the Baltimore vase, so that in point of time these two vases are practically contemporary. The inscription of this side is ΕΓΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ ΚΑΥΟΣ. Hoppin feels that this vase is probably from the hand of Euphronios.¹

The other Epidromos vase, *Boston 01.8018*, has been attributed to the early period of Euphronios by Hartwig.² Hoppin, I, no. 43, p. 423.

Interior. On the interior of this vase are two wreathed Komasts on a couch, nude save for a little drapery falling over the legs. At the left a youth, seated full-front, is leaning over and vomiting. His

¹ Hoppin, I, p. 408.

² Hartwig, pp. 127 ff.

right leg is drawn up, so that the foot is seen full-front upon the couch, while he rests his right hand upon his knee. The finger nails of the hand are represented by black spots. The left foot rests lightly upon the floor. The other Komast, with slight moustache and beard, is seen three quarters front facing the left. He is leaning against a cushion, and playing the flutes. Both legs are raised and are apparently resting upon the couch. On the floor near the couch his boots are seen. Behind the two youths on the wall hangs a flute case. Anatomical details are elaborately indicated throughout. The inscription is ΕΡΙΔΡΟΜΟΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ. By Hoppin and Beazley this vase is listed with the work of Euphronios's assistant, the "Panaitios Painter"; but Miss Radford¹ gives it to Euphronios himself, for she says the picture is well composed, and the heads might easily be by him, while the drawing of the frontal foot is in his style.² We have already noted that Hartwig attributes it to the early work of Euphronios and this seems logical in view of the fact that the *καλός*-name, Leagros, belongs to the early period of that master and only appears on works signed by him as painter. By the time he had set up a shop for himself and was employing such men as the "Panaitios Painter," the *καλός*-name, Leagros, had apparently fallen into disuse; and therefore, one might think that Epidromos, which is found with it on the Baltimore vase, also belongs to this early period and could not have been used by the "Panaitios Painter." This is a possible point of view, but, on the other hand, there is no reason for assuming that the *καλός*-name, Epidromos, ceased to be used at the same time that Leagros fell into disfavor. It is quite reasonable to suppose that it was linked with Leagros at a time when that name was losing popularity, and that Epidromos itself continued to be used for some time thereafter, but used alone, as it appears on all but one of the Epidromos vases. If this is the case, there is no reason why it should not have been used by the "Panaitios Painter" as well as by Euphronios himself.

In this case I am inclined to agree with Beazley and Hoppin in their attribution to the "Panaitios Painter," as the vase seems slightly freer in style than the other Epidromos vases, and moreover, the Komos

¹ *J. H. S.*, XXXV, 1915, p. 118.

² I have found no vase signed by Euphronios as painter where the frontal foot occurs, though that would scarcely be a conclusive argument that he did not use it.

is a favorite subject with that painter, if we may judge from the vases attributed to him.¹

Perrot² thinks the style of this vase recalls the work of Euphronios far more than that of Chachrylion; and in fact he can see no grounds for attributing any of the Epidromos vases to Chachrylion, for they are far in advance of our master, not only in the execution of the figures, but in the lively movement as well. After careful study of these vases, I am forced to come to the same conclusion, for, as noted in the discussion of the vases themselves, there are numerous points in which they fail to resemble the signed works of Chachrylion.

There is no reason why the Baltimore vase on which Hartwig bases his argument should not be the work of Euphronios's early activity, since Leagros appears on his vases as well as on those of Chachrylion. It seems to me that the Epidromos vases, nine in number, if we exclude the two of which the signatures are not authentic, are all from the same shop, as the careful execution, advanced problems of foreshortening, and elaborate interior compositions would seem to testify. On this basis, and owing to the fact that the two Epidromos vases just discussed are generally attributed to Euphronios, or his assistant, the "Panaitios Painter," and not to Chachrylion, I feel justified in considering Euphronios responsible for the whole group. Moreover, the two Epidromos vases attributed to Euphronios or his assistant bear strong stylistic resemblances to the Epidromos vases formerly attributed to Chachrylion.

Of the ten anonymous vases, formerly considered to bear the *καλός*-name, Epidromos (really eleven if we include the Baltimore vase with its double *καλός*-name), two must be excluded from this class, for the ΕΓ on the Berlin vase (Inv. 3239) is modern and the inscription of the Brussels Museum vase (our list, no. IX) is wrongly restored. Of the nine which remain, it is impossible to attribute all with certainty, as adequate reproductions cannot be obtained, but many of them are undoubtedly the work of Euphronios, and all are surely the product of his influence. In my opinion they should be grouped as follows:

¹ Hoppin, I, p. 428, nos. 59, 61.

² Perrot and Chipiez, X, pp. 387-388.

By Euphronios:

1. Baltimore kylix (no. II), having both Epidromos and Leagros.
2. British Museum E 25 (no. IV).
3. British Museum E 43 (no. VI).
4. Louvre G 112 (no. V).
5. Lost. Formerly in Canino Collection (no. III).
6. Berlin Inv. 3232 (no. XII).

Doubtful:

1. Petrograd kylix (no. VIII).
2. Lost (no. VII).

"Panaitios Painter":

1. Boston Museum 01.8018.

Finally, of all the vases formerly attributed to the hand of Chachrylion, the only one that may safely be assigned to his hand is no. I of our list, Louvre G 40.

CONCLUSION

At the risk of some repetition I shall now attempt to group together the various points in regard to Chachrylion which have been made during the course of this discussion. On stylistic grounds, he is a worker trained in the school of Epiktetos and the probable teacher of Euphronios. The date of Chachrylion's activity falls approximately between 510 and 480 B.C., dates determined by his relation to the other painters of this period, and also by a consideration of the *καλός*-names employed by him.

Furthermore, he signs his vases with *ἐποίησεν* throughout, a fact which has caused some authorities to think that he was only a potter and that several painters were engaged in the decoration of his fabric. But the differences in the style of the drawing on the different vases are only of minor importance and such as could well be expected from a transitional painter. I believe I have shown that the question of *ἐποίησεν* and *ἔγραψεν* cannot be considered as satisfactorily settled at the present time. I have attempted to trace the development of the proprietorship-theory, but have found that there was no apparently clear process of reasoning responsible for it. In my opinion, the theory may have arisen from the desire to solve the problem of unusual stylis-

tic divergences occurring on vases bearing the same signature and always accompanied by *ἐποίησεν*. I am not prepared to state that the proprietorship-theory is false, but I do believe that it has been given undue importance in connection with artists of the early red-figured period preceding Euphronios and even contemporary with his early work. Though the meaning of the verb *ἐποίησεν* may have changed in the red figured period, it seems to me that, at least during the period of the Epiktetan Cycle and the time of our master, it might still be used with the double connotation which it surely had during the black-figured period. No hard and fast rules can be laid down as yet in regard to the use of these verbs, and I feel convinced that the artist who signs *ἐποίησεν* is really far more important than the one who signs *ἔγραψεν* only. If the Greeks used the system which Hambidge¹ has worked out, and which, as he has treated it, seems entirely probable, the potter of a vase must have required far more skill than a mere painter to be able to shape his vase so that each subordinate part would bear a proper relation to the entire design, while at the same time allowing just enough margin for the vase to remain true to measurement after the inevitable shrinkage from baking.

In my opinion, only one hand is distinguishable in the painting of Chachrylion's vases, with the exception of the British Museum vase (97.10-28.2), on which the inscription undoubtedly has been wrongly restored, and which I have discarded on this ground.

It is to be noted that Chachrylion is not bound down by the conventions of the older school to the exclusion of new ideas, for we find him among the first to make use of two figures in the interior decoration. He is also gifted with a fair amount of originality in the handling of old subjects, and is an innovator as well, for, so far as I know, the Eros flying over the sea is an original contribution by our master; and if he is not the first to make use of the Theseus cycle of deeds, he is at least one of the earliest to depict that subject.

It is hardly necessary to enumerate again his peculiarities of style. In general, his figures are slim, though not so elongated as those of Epiktetos, or so sturdy as those of Euphronios. Although faulty

¹ J. Hambidge, *Dynamic Symmetry*, especially pp. 44, 86-87, 101-103, and Appendix, note I, p. 143. The Boston Museum vase of Chachrylion (95.33) is listed in the table on p. 115 as belonging to the root-two shape.

proportions and poor workmanship are often noticeable in the hands and feet, the drawing of the rest of the body is firm and true, showing a fairly accurate knowledge of anatomy. Some vases show experiments with the problems of foreshortening which are not particularly satisfactory, but in the matter of composition Chachrylion is quite successful. Not only are the figures well arranged, but the subject matter is interesting and worthy of careful study.

In regard to attributed vases, it has been necessary to rob him of most of his glory, for there is only one that can really be accepted with any certainty, namely, the vase in the Louvre (G 40) signed merely *ἐποίησεν*. But in taking from him the Epidromos group, I hope that a service has really been rendered as this will help to remove an entirely erroneous impression of his style.

A NEW APPROACH TO THE TEXT OF PLINY'S LETTERS

BY EDWARD KENNARD RAND

ARTICLE II

THE present paper continues the discussion begun in my previous article.¹ The latter part of that article consisted of an examination of the different interests displayed by Aldus and Budaëus in that part of Book 8 which the former edited for the first time. I turn now to the text of the *Letters* in Book 9, 16 and Book 10. As my space is limited, I can here treat only of the portion of Book 10 (*Letters* 41-121) which Avantius was the first to publish, in 1502.

A. Aldus and Budaëus in *Epist.* 9, 16

This letter, missing in editions before Aldus, was copied by Budaëus in the margin of his edition of Beroaldus, which with the edition of Avantius of *Letters* 41-121 and Budaëus's supplements of the rest of the *Letters*, made up his improved and private copy of Pliny's work.² Mr. Merrill states³ that the added letter of Book 9 "contains no indications of value for the present discussion." It is short, and yet one or two points which it raises may profitably detain us a moment. If *I* in Book 8 was copied not directly from *P* but from *I*^o, a manuscript collated with *P*, it seems most probable that it was a copy of this kind from which Budaëus inserted the present letter. Mr. Merrill is sure

¹ *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXXIV (1923), pp. 79-191. I will refer to this article as *Article I*. References to the *Carnegie Publication* are to *A Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger. A study of six leaves of an uncial manuscript preserved in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York*, by E. A. Lowe and E. K. Rand, 1922. With the admirable work of G. Carlsson, *Zur Textkritik der Pliniusbriefe*, Lund, 1922, I am not here concerned, since the class of manuscripts represented by *MV*, to which he devotes special attention, do not contain Book 10.

² See Mr. Merrill's Teubner edition of the *Letters*, p. xxii.

³ *Classical Philology*, XIV (1919), p. 30.

that Budaeus must have drawn directly from *P*, but after what we have seen in Book 8, we have no right to make that assumption.¹ I will continue therefore to use the symbol *I*^o for the codex prepared for Budaeus's use, very possibly by Jucundus.

In the address, *i* deletes *maxime* before *Mamiliano*. This may be his own error that he corrects. Possibly, however, he found it in *I*^o, and then corrected it.

239, 21 (247, 9) *copiosissimo*]. This is omitted by *i*. Was it lacking in *P*? Is it not an example of Aldus's habit of useless interpolation? No, it is supported by *M* (in the form *cupiosissimo*), just as we found *M* supporting *a* in various readings of Book 8 against an error of *I*.²

239, 23 (247, 11) *non uacat — non libet*] These words are not in *M*; the omission is an easy one, for *nec libet* immediately precedes. But should we not, once more, suspect Aldus of attempting *suo Marte* to fill in a lacuna? No, for the words are given by *i*. See the numerous cases in Book 8 where *I* supports *a* against *M*.³

239, 25 (247, 13) *tibique*] *M*. This seems the most satisfactory reading, though *i* with *cui* and *a* with *quos* are equally intelligible. Either may well be suspected of emendation; for supposing that *P* read *que*, it is difficult to see why anybody should wish to improve it. I would suggest that *que* was omitted in *P*, and that Budaeus and Aldus supplied the gap in different ways. This case has a parallel in 216, 3 (222, 14) *periment*; see *Article I*, p. 157.

Short though this letter is, it shows us in miniature some of the conditions which we have seen illustrated *in extenso* in the readings of Book 8.

B. Aldus and Budaeus in Book 10, 41-121

1. Estimates of Aldus and of the editors who preceded him

We are now ready to examine the text of Book 10. The latter half, *Letters* 41-121, according to the present numbering, had been published before Aldus, first by Avantius in 1502, then by Beroaldus in the same year, and then by Catanaeus in 1506. Mr. Hardy,⁴ following Keil,⁵ has given a succinct and interesting account of these editions, and Mr.

¹ See *Article I*, pp. 172-178.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 158 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 160 ff.

⁴ In his edition of Book 10, 1889, pp. 65 ff.

⁵ Pp. xxxiii ff.

Merrill¹ after investigating the matter afresh, agrees essentially with their estimate of Avantius, Beroaldus and Catanaeus. The first had used a copy taken from *Parisinus*, but his successors had no new manuscript at their disposal. But both these editors scrutinized the text intelligently, and while making numerous unnecessary conjectures, contributed much to its improvement. The text of Avantius surely needed to be improved. His copy had been made for him by a certain Petrus Leander. Avantius described it as defective and corrupt, and declared that he had corrected it to the best of his ability;² but some of the readings that Avantius could print are startling in the extreme. Then comes Aldus, in 1508, with his much belauded *Parisinus*, and revolutionizes the text of Book 10. It is not a peaceful and constitutional revolution like that of the ancient Romans, according to Livy, against their kings, but as Keil and Mr. Merrill see it, a wild and flaming anarchy. Keil expressly declares that though Aldus possessed the copy of *Parisinus* made by Jucundus as well as *Parisinus* itself, or says that he had them, his text has no more authority than that of Beroaldus or Catanaeus; he merely repeated the edition of Avantius improved by the conjectures of Beroaldus and Catanaeus, and new ones of his own; all differences between Avantius and Aldus are the latter's private inventions, which in the vast majority of cases are both rash and wrong, though in a few places, certain trifling errors of the earlier editions have been satisfactorily emended.³

This is a lowly estate to which the once standard edition of Book 10 has descended. Keil does not deny that Aldus may have received the *Parisinus*, but all that he did with it, apparently, was to gaze on the covers, observe the extraordinary age and difficulty of the script, and

¹ C. P., V (1910), pp. 451 ff.

² Keil, edition, p. xxxiv: Petri Leandri industria ex Gallia Plinii iunioris ad Traianum epistolas licet mancas deprauatasque habuimus: quas pro uirili mea castigatas impressorum beneficio emittendas censuimus.

³ Edition, p. xxxvii: Nam ea quae aliter in Aldina editione atque in illis [i.e. Beroaldus and Catanaeus] exhibentur ita comparata sunt omnia, ut coniectura potius inventa quam e codice profecta esse existimanda sint. et plurima quidem in pravis et temerariis interpolationibus versantur, paucis locis leviora quaedam priorum editionum vitia probabiliter correctae sunt. quare ut in iis epistulis quare ab Avantio editae erant vix quicquam novi quod e codice petatum sit accessit, ita facile intellegitur in iis quarum omnis memoria ab Aldina editione petenda est multo minus accurate, quam ab Avantio factum erat, codicem expressum esse.

compose a forensic eulogy of the book in honor of the noble Venetian who had lent it to him. Why should he use it in editing the latter half of Book 10 with Avantius, Beroaldus, Catanaeus and his own inventions to guide him?

This estimate of Aldus at which Keil arrived after a study of the text of this book was considerably modified by Hardy. For Hardy had discovered in the Bodleian volume, so he thought, the very material that Aldus had turned over to his printer. On this theory, it became necessary to suppose that Aldus had introduced numerous changes in his proof, including conjectures, but the foundation of his text, in the portion that we are here examining, is not Avantius straight, but Avantius as corrected from *P* by Jucundus. For *Letters* 1-40, he had the manuscript copy of *P*, also provided with the corrections of Jucundus. Accordingly, Hardy's estimate of Aldus's performance is stated thus¹ (the italics are mine):

Wherever Aldus and B. [the Bodleian volume] agree, *as they do in the great majority of cases*, Aldus has conscientiously followed the copy of the codex, while in cases of disagreement he either (1) took the reading of previous editions, or (2) inserted interpolations and conjectures of his own, or possibly (3) made alterations from the original codex, when he received it from Mocenigo.

Mr. Merrill demolished this attractive theory of Hardy's, with results unpropitious for Aldus. The Bodleian volume, which never saw the inside of the Aldine establishment, presents evidence not from within but from without, not for but against the integrity of the edition of 1508. For just as in Book 8, with an application of Mr. Merrill's criterion, the deviations of Aldus from his belauded manuscript can be instantly detected by the concordance of *M* and *I* (*i*), so in the latter part of Book 10, the concordance of Avantius and *i* is disastrous, it would seem, for any marked differences in the Aldine text; the truer witness to *P* is Avantius. Mr. Merrill can speak² (italics mine) of the "conjectural expansions by Aldus, *after his confirmed manner*, of the briefer and sincerer readings of *Parisinus*, which Avantius more truly presents." More than this, as we have seen, Mr. Merrill out-Keils Keil by extending his estimate of Aldus in Book 10 to cover the work of Aldus in the entire body of the *Letters*.³

¹ In his edition of Book 10, 1889, p. 71.

² *C. P.*, V, p. 459.

³ *Ibid.*, XIV, pp. 29 ff.

This judgment by two eminent critics of the text of Pliny is not lightly to be set aside. It is based on an intimate acquaintance with the *Letters* and a minute examination of the many problems of the text. Nevertheless, coming fresh from a study of the life of Aldus, the character of his great undertaking, and the critical principles which he professes to observe,¹ I find it hard to reconcile the picture of Aldus displayed in his utterances with that which Keil and Mr. Merrill have here presented. The account given by these scholars looks more like caricature than description. Clearly, if Aldus can speak of the task of the editor as that of saving ancient texts from wanton conjectures and yet can exhibit this same high-handed procedure in his own edition, we shall have to serve him with the epithet which Mr. Merrill found appropriate, despite Sabbadini, for Catanaeus, — “un grande imbroglione.”² Perhaps that is what Aldus is. But it is the part of courtesy to refrain from so labelling him until we are compelled so to do.

In the Carnegie publication (p. 65), I admitted that, in Book 10, Avantius and the Bodleian volume in its added part are better authorities for the *Parisinus* than is Aldus. Perhaps that admission, which Mr. Merrill judges fatal to my case, will still have to be made. And perhaps it is not altogether fatal. It may be that, confronted by the exceedingly difficult problems with which the text of Book 10 bristles, Aldus found the *Parisinus* more corrupt than elsewhere and was therefore compelled to accept more conjectures whether made by himself or by his predecessors or by Jucundus, than was his wont. For these reasons the edition of Avantius may be nearer to *P*. This fact, if it is a fact, does not detract, I believe, from my conclusion (p. 65) that *for the entire text of the Letters*, Aldus is a much better authority than the Bodleian volume as a whole, and “that he should be given, not absolute confidence, but far more confidence than editors have thus far allowed him.” Moreover, after examining the workings of Mr. Merrill’s law of Aldine detection in Book 8, and seeing Aldus, crushed flat to earth, rise up again, I am not disposed to expect that despite the difficulties of the text of Book 10, Aldus should suddenly

¹ See *Article I*, pp. 138-150, and on Aldus’s ability to tell a genuinely ancient codex, pp. 89-99.

² *C. P.*, V, p. 466. Whatever the moral failings of Catanaeus, I am inclined to harbor what will doubtless seem a very rash suspicion that his second edition of the *Letters* (1518) is one of the best, — perhaps the best, — that has appeared.

appear in a new rôle, and clutter his pages with conjectures. I need not apprise the reader that I am dallying a bit with antecedent probabilities.

But to come to facts, my concession in favor of Avantius was made before I had access to Mr. Merrill's edition, in which for the first time the readings of *i* are presented completely. I can now supplement them, also, with rotographs of all Book 10. As a result, I have reason for decidedly modifying my opinion of Avantius and Aldus as sources for the *Parisinus* in that book.

2. *The text of Avantius*

From what Keil and Mr. Merrill say of Aldus, one might imagine that Avantius, favorably contrasted with him, is a typically conservative critic, who follows the maxim proposed by Aldus in his edition of Theocritus: "*Non enim recipio me emendaturum libros.*"¹ Such a critic would aim to lay the foundations with a careful copy of *Parisinus* and to deviate very little from its readings, right or wrong. Unhappily, this is not a true picture of the situation. Avantius was a busy editor. With all that he undertook, he could not have devoted much time to any particular text. This is likewise true of Aldus, as we have seen — but with a difference. In the preface to his edition of Lucretius, published for Aldus in 1500,² Avantius speaks of having recently edited Ausonius, Catullus, the *Priapea*, the *Letters* of Pliny, and the *Siluae* of Statius. This reference to an edition of the *Letters* prior to 1500 was a mystery to Firmin-Didot and is to me; as the 1502 edition is a rarity,³ perhaps the earlier one has completely disappeared — I have made no search for it among the bibliographers of early printed books. For the edition of Lucretius, Avantius had made no special preparation, — save the admirable preparation of learning his poet by heart — and he resorted to conjectures freely. This is why Aldus determined to secure a new edition of the poet, which appeared under the supervision of Navagero in 1515.⁴ With regard to the *Pliny*, it

¹ See *Article I*, p. 141.

² See A. Firmin-Didot, *Alde Manuce et l'Hellénisme à Venise*, 1875, p. 146.

³ Keil, edition, p. xxxv.

⁴ Firmin-Didot, *Alde Manuce*, p. 145. Mr. Hardy, *Journal of Philology*, XVII (1888), p. 96, remarks that Avantius's edition of Sallust's *Catiline* was not conspicuous for its correctness.

were exceedingly rash to assume, after Avantius's words, that his copy of *P*, though made with no design at improvement, was faithful. He called his codex *mancus et deprauatus*. He saw its gaps¹ and its corruptions, and declares that he *emended* it — *castigavit*. Just how far this emendation proceeded we may never know. I shall point out a few cases in which the conjecturer's art has been (unsuccessfully) applied, and there may well be others less easy to detect. A text that is acknowledged to be corrupt, defective and emended is not the kind that one would regard as good authority for the manuscript from which it is copied. Mr. Merrill could say of the manuscript available for Avantius:²

Either Peter Leander, who furnished Avantius with his copy of the letters to and from Trajan, or else the actual copyist of the letters, must have been as careless in copying, as his loss of the sheets containing his transcript of x. 1-40 would seem to imply, for the editing and the printing are not likely to be responsible for so many errors as the edition of Avantius evidently contains.

And again,³ "Avantius, I suspect, did not reproduce it [*P*] with sufficient faithfulness."

This suspicion of Mr. Merrill's seems amply justified by numerous readings of Avantius. I select only a few typical examples, which will also show, as later I will more extensively illustrate, the procedure of Aldus and of Budaeus. Let us remember that I am examining this aspect of our problem, as all aspects of it, under the assumption that Aldus consulted something more than the covers of the *Parisinus* and that the latter was a veritably ancient codex the text of which he treated conservatively. I am not begging this proposition; I am continuing to test an hypothesis, for the correctness of which I have, I believe, offered additional proof in my examination of Aldus's editorial standards and achievements. I am also assuming that *i* is drawn either mediately or immediately from *P*, — at least for most of its readings — and that therefore a concordance of *i* and *a* will generally establish the reading of the ancient manuscript.⁴

¹ Why this statement might not include a reference to the missing first half of the book (*C. P.*, V, p. 452), I cannot make out.

² *Selected Letters of the Younger Pliny*, 1903, pp. ix ff.

³ *C. P.*, II (1907), p. 149.

⁴ For the letters of Book 10, I have not added page references to Keil. The

(a) *Errors of Avantius*

43 (280, 10) haec] *i Ber. Cat. a* Nec *A*.

It would hardly seem that this error could be made in a copy taken directly from *P*, if *P* was an ancient book in majuscules. The error derives rather from the original of *A* (I will call it *A*^o), a minuscule copy given Avantius by Petrus Leander.

47 (281, 5) rationes] *i Ber. Cat. a* stationes *A*. In *A*^o, *r* was mistaken for *st*. This looks like a high minuscule *r* in the original, if the error is palaeographical and not the product of sheer stupidity.

56 (284, 4) quos] *ia Ber. Cat.* equos *A*. No horses are needed in this sentence.

58 (285, 8) patris tui] *ia Ber. Cat.* patris sui *A*.

Thus far the blunders of *A* were at once emended by Beroaldus, whose reading was accepted by his successors. But *ai*, I should infer, also saw it in *P*.

65 (288, 16) *Aa* have the following lemma: De adsertione (adfectione *A*) ingenuorum qui pro (pro *om. A*) seruis educati sunt.

The first error here again suggests minuscules, if the error is palaeographical. Similarly cf. 66 (289, 12) adsertationem] adfertationem (*corr. ut uidetur i*) *A*.

74 (292, 9) aposphragisma] *ia Ber. Cat.* aposphargisma *A*.

Greek is not a strong point of *A*.

77 (293, 8) sunt] *ia Ber. Cat.* suum *A*.

79 (294, 8) a destinatis] *ia Ber. Cat.* adest natis *A*.

P was correct; cf. *ia*. This error seems to be a combination of wrong word-division plus a stupid resort to conjecture, to make the half-words mean something.

81 (295, 1) Cocceianus Dion in bule] (coccianus *i*) *ia* cocciamis diambulae *A* coccianus Dion bulae *Ber.* Cocceianus Dion *Cat.*

This is an instructive case. Beroaldus did as well as anybody could demand with the monstrosity that he found in Avantius. Catanaeus

number of the letter will guide the reader to his edition whenever necessary. It is a pity that Mr. Merrill did not imitate Keil in adding in brackets the letter-numbering used by some of the older editors, particularly Kortte and Orelli, whose works are still worth consulting without waste of time. It would also have helped, and cost little space, to have given in the *apparatus* Avantius's numbering of the letters.

remedied the spelling of the first name, which apparently is transmitted correctly in 82 (296, 10), but he reprehensibly omitted *bulae* which seemed to mean nothing. Aldus and Budaeus independently got the correct reading from *P*, except that *i* did not trouble to correct *coccianus*. Perhaps, however, *P* was at fault here, Aldus getting the right spelling from *Cat.* rather than from *P*. But *in bule* he took from *P*.

82 (296, 10) *ciuitatis*] *ia ei litis A eius Ber. rei publicae id Cat.*
Here *Ber.* is less successful. It is not the interests of Dion that are concerned, but those of the state. This was plain to *Cat.*, but his method of emending is violent. The reading of *ia*, taken from *P*, clears up the whole problem instantly. Keil, with good sense, adopted the reading of *a*, which I suppose he considered a conjecture of Aldus's, right for once. But now the testimony of *i* shows that it came from the ancient manuscript. *A°*, it would appear, — or perhaps its source? — had an abbreviation for *ciuitatis* such as would appear in late minuscules.

87 (297, 20) *et exegi ut] ia et exuit A et exciui ut Ber. ut Cat.*
Again Keil rightly follows *a*, now supported by *i*. *A°* had omitted the syllable *eg* and read the rest as *uit*, perhaps resorting to that species of conjecture which we have noted as a possibility in 79 (294, 8) *adest natis*. But perhaps as in 82 just above, we should assume a copy between *P* and *A°* (I will call it *A'*), which was responsible for part of the error (here the omission of the syllable *eg*), while *A°* then improved the remainder to the best of his ability. *Ber.*'s emendation is palaeographically attractive, but the verb is not quite what the sense requires. *Cat.*, like Marcion, emended with the sword rather than the pen.

93 (299, 13) *erantum] ia Ber. Eranos Cat. Eia num A.*
The error of *A*, treated felicitously by *Ber.*, is clearly palaeographical; *r* and *i* could hardly be confused in any script except late minuscule. If *Cat.* is the basic text of *a*, the latter might well have been satisfied with *Eranos*, *Cat.*'s conjecture, which indeed almost seems required by the use of the plural in the preceding letter (200, 7). I infer that Aldus made the change from what he found in *P*, and so did *i*.

95 (300, 7) *professus sum] ia Cat. professum A professus Ber.*
The error of *A* might have arisen from the use of the semi-circular

compendium for *us* written above *s*. *Cat.* saw what had occurred; his emendation was confirmed by *P* (*ia*).

110 (305, 5) *bule et ecclesia*] *i Cat.*¹ *et bule et ecclesia a Cat.*² *boyali et ecclesia A Ber.*

Here *A* was too much for *Ber.*, though not for the latter's successor, who again was confirmed by *P*. Did Aldus insert *et* on his own responsibility? We may note in *Article I* (pp. 160 ff.) various little words — *et, sunt, iam, aut, ergo, ad* — read by *a* which later proved not to be in *M*, but which still later were all confirmed by *I*. In Book 8, then, Aldus did not have a habit of sticking in little words unnecessarily. He was once suspected of so doing, by Keil, but the discovery of *I* has vindicated him. Why should it be different in Book 10? Of course it is pertinent to ask, why then does not *i* have *et*? We had better learn a little more of the characteristics of *i* before answering.

The above list, which might be extended, is sufficient to show the character of the errors of *A*. They are not such as would appear in a faithful copy of an ancient but defective archetype. The passages in *Letters* 81, 82 and 87 show that in *P* the reading was excellent and plain. It can hardly be that in three such cases *a* and *i* arrive at the correct text by independent emendation. The nature of the readings is against such a possibility, and we shall see more evidence against it in a moment. Rather, *i* and *a* have drawn the right reading in every case from *P*. The blunders of *A*, therefore, are not of the kind that enables a keen critic to see through error into truth. They represent not an accurate copy of some ancient confusion, but the wretched stupidities of Petrus Leander or the scribe who made his copy. This copy, further, may have been made not from *P* directly but from an intervening copy in minuscules. Sometimes Beroaldus or Catanaeus can unravel the knot, but sometimes, as in the three cases described, they cannot; Aldus and Budaeus could, not because they were keener critics, but because they collated *P*.

(b) *Emendations of Avantiis*

There is another and a more dangerous kind of error in *A*, and that is, as I have indicated above,¹ deliberate emendation.

¹ P. 143.

47 (281, 10) praeire] *ia* praecipere *A*

The reading of *A* was retained by *Ber.* and *Cat.*, defended by Longolius and accepted by Orelli and Keil. It was easy to call *a*'s *praeire* a conjecture. But now that *i* shows its presence in *P*, Mr. Merrill rightly puts it back into the text. Evidently besides the technical use of the word, as in *Letter* 53, it has come to be used in a more general sense, like *praecipere* in 72 (291, 18), a passage to which Longolius refers. *Praecipere* is thus an excellent gloss on *praeire*. In *A*, it has replaced the text.

48 (281, 14) iunxeras] *a* iniunxeras *A*

This might be considered a simple dittography in *A* (in which *in* is abbreviated, as Keil reports), but it is strange, if this is so, that the same mistake should occur in 60 (286, 29). It would seem, therefore, that the alteration was intentional.

52 (282, 24) praeiuimus] praeiimus *a* preiimus|praeiuimus *i* prae-
buimus *A Ber. Cat.*

Longolius recognized that *praebuimus* is a gloss and Keil prints what he probably considered a conjecture, — right for a second time, — by Aldus. But this is now backed up by *i*. It would appear that the copy at the disposal of Budaeus (*I*^o) had *preiimus*, which he first wrote exactly as he found it, later adding (*suo Marte*) what he conceived to be the correct spelling, *praeiuimus*. The concordance of *a* and the first variant of *i* would seem to establish *praeiimus* as the reading of *P*.

54 (283, 7) De pecunia foenebri] *a* De pecunia fenoris *A*

In this *lemma*, *a* certainly has the *lectio difficilior*. *A* has apparently made it easier by a conjectural emendation.

54 (283, 12) mutuantur] *ia Ber.* inueniantur *Cat.* muniantur *A*

Possibly *A*'s reading is merely a scribal error, but it looks suspicious. *Ber.*'s conjecture is confirmed by *P* (*ia*), while that of *Cat.*, though not half bad, is ruled out. Appreciating the new authority which Aldus had brought to light, *Cat.*² reads *mutuantur*. On the other hand, *i*² thought *Cat.*'s conjecture *inueniantur* worth adding in the margin.¹

58 (285, 14) Flavius Archippus philosophus impetrauit a me ut
agrum † ei adderem circa Prusiadam, patriam suam, tam uberem]
I have given the text of Keil, which he naturally marks corrupt. It is

¹ Mr. Merrill incorrectly reports the reading of *i*² as *muniantur* — which would be a curious return on the part of *i* to the absurdity of *A*.

that of *A*, untouched by *Ber.* or *Cat.* Aldus flares out with *Flavius . . . agrum ei ·DC· circa Prusiadam patriam suam emi iuberem*. What could be more suspicious? Keil keeps hands off, returns to the honest Avantius, finds *agrum ei adderem* too hard a morsel, but swallows *tam uberem* without difficulty. But now comes *i* to the rescue, with substantially the reading of Aldus, *Flavius . . . agrum ei ad ·C· circa Prusiadam patriam suam emi iuberem*. This is highly instructive. Our confidence in the simplicity of Avantius ought to be thoroughly shaken. He gets *adderem* out of *ad ·C·* (or *·DC·*), and the smooth and deceptive *tam uberem* is sheer conjecture made from some misreading of *emi iuberem*. If this is not high-handed procedure, what is? Aldus has been vindicated once more, and that by Mr. Merrill (with the help of *i*). How many times must we see Aldus pulled out of these sloughs of despond before we admit that he has been on *terra firma* all the time? In one point, *i* seems superior to *a*; we should read, with Hardy and Mr. Merrill, *ad ·C·* not *·DC·*. *Ad* is attested by *adderem* in *A*. I am not inclined to think with Hardy that "Aldus, perhaps thinking the sum 100,000 sesterces too small, conjectured *DC* for *ad C.*" He, too, must have known that Pliny (*Ep.* 6, 3, 1) bought an *agellus* for his old nurse for 100,000. It is at least as likely that he misread his manuscript here. If it was in *uncials*, his error would be especially easy to make. And see below, p. 163.

61 (287, 5) *periculo] a cuniculo A Ber. Cat.*

Few, if any, modern editors of Pliny can be enticed into *A*'s rabbit-burrow. It would seem that *A* (or *A°*), starting with some monstrous corruption of *periculo*, changed it to *cuniculo*, imagining that this word could be applied to the canal of which Pliny is speaking. It is manifestly inappropriate in this sense; *Cat.* subtly interprets it as meaning *suffugio, excusationi*. He adds (second edition): *Quidam legunt periculo, quod non improbo*. He speaks of "certain people," but he means Aldus. In my edition of Catanaeus (Ascensius, 1533), *periculo* has been taken into the text. But what of *i*? Budaeus has done nothing to the reading of *A*. Did he find nothing new in *P* or did he fail to note what was there? We will revert to this question in a moment.

98 (302, 11) *sicut turpis] a situ turpis A Ber. Cat.*

a has changed the whole phrasing here, and consequently is rejected

by modern editors. But *sicut* is universally accepted. If it were supported by *i*, it would be regarded as the reading of *P*. I should still so regard it. In this case, *A* has committed a palpable emendation by conjecture.

120 (309, 11) sero] *a sic sero A Ber. Cat.*, "*fortasse recte*," Merrill Mr. Merrill agrees with Keil in not taking *sic* into the text, despite his note in the apparatus. If it is not to be accepted, it is most probably an incorporated gloss. If so, why is not *tibi* just above (l. 8) in the same category? And when *ia* in 76 (292, 26) have *quod optimum*, why not, with Kortte and Orelli, accept this reading? *A*, followed by *Ber.* and *Cat.*, has *quid potissimum*. This phrase has just occurred (l. 24-25) and makes a satisfactory gloss, — for one who thought any gloss necessary — to write above *quod optimum*; the glossator would indicate that Pliny is saying the same thing in a different way. Mr. Merrill reads *quod potissimum* and attributes this emendation to Orelli. So does Keil; but *quod potissimum* finds no place in either the text or the apparatus of Orelli, — not at any rate in the copy that I consulted.

One more case of a gloss. 73 (291, 23) ueris] *A Ber. Cat. (lineolam subduxit et notam ./ postea erasam in marg. sine alio apposuit) i suis a Trajan* writes (this is the whole letter):

Si mihi senatus consultum miseris, quod haesitationem tibi fecit, aestimabo an debeas cognoscere de agnoscendis liberis et natalibus ueris restituendis.

Suis for *ueris* is certainly the *lectio difficilior*. To accept it, one need not exalt Trajan as *Imperator Romanus* to a station *supra grammaticam*. This use of *suus* is perfectly good Latin,¹ but it is not the ordinary use. *Ueris* is a natural gloss, but it was not derived by *A* from *P*. What might Budaeus have made out in his copy of the latter

¹ Cf. e.g. Cicero *Div. in Caec.* 6, 21: *cur iis . . . persequendi iuris sui . . . adimis potestatem?* More than this, as my colleague Professor A. A. Howard kindly pointed out to me, Trajan is speaking in technical terms. Cf. *Digesta*, ed. Mommsen-Krüger, 40, 11, *De Natalibus Restituendis*. Ulpian, Marcianus, Scaevola, and Paulus have *natalibus suis*. Marcianus and Modestinus omit *suis* in some instances. Döring has an excellent note in his edition of the *Letters*, Freyberg, 1843: Ich habe hier nicht mit Orelli nach den ältesten Ausgaben *ueris* aufnehmen können, denn einmal ist *natalibus suis restituere* die eigenthümliche in der römischen Rechtssprache allein übliche Redensart, sodann sieht *ueris* einem Versuch, den Ausdruck zu erklären, doch zu ähnlich aus.

manuscript that induced him to add a reference-sign, though later deciding not to add the variant? Most probably *suis*, I should say, which Aldus was the first to restore to the text from the ancient source.¹

In fine, the text of Avantius proceeds from an unusually bungling copy, — so described by Avantius himself — in which clear and excellent readings of *P* have been transformed into monstrosities. Starting with such a text, some glosser and conjectural critic has made his contribution. The instances which I have cited are serious enough to suggest that others are latent in the text, though impossible of detection. Who would have suspected *tam uberem* without the help of *ia*? If a book of this sort is a better source than *a* for *P* in the second half of Book 10, then *a* must be a wretched source indeed.

3. Aldus supported by Budaeus

In a number of the instances just discussed primarily to exhibit the imperfections of Avantius, we have found the reading of *a*, which, unsupported, caused grave suspicion in the mind of Keil, now confirmed by *i* and read by Mr. Merrill. An impressive list of such cases might be discussed if my space and the reader's patience permitted. I can at least state that in no less than 34 cases, — I am including those already discussed² — *a* is supported by *i* in a reading (in a few cases

¹ Mr. Merrill has not quite accurately described the notes in *i*. The sign '/,', often employed by *i* to refer to a variant, is placed above *ueris* as well as in the margin. In the rotograph the marginal sign shows no indication of erasure; but as Mr. Merrill studied the original, he is doubtless right on this point.

² I mark with a star (*) the readings accepted by Mr. Merrill but not by Keil. *47 (281, 10) *praeire*; 48 (281, 17) *recusauerint*; 49 (282, 1) *dicta*; 52 (282, 23) *innisa*; (24) *praeiuimus*; *58 (285, 14) *agrum ei* etc.; (16) *praestari*; 63 (288, 6) *quem*; 65 (288, 18) *θεπετροβς*; *(22) *exemplis* (Keil preferred to trust an emendation by *Ber.* rather than what he thought one by *a*); 72 (291, 12) *agnoscendis* (*a* and Budaeus in *Pand.*); *77 (293, 7) *est*; 79 (293, 27) *ceperint*; 81 (295, 1) *Dion in bule*; (5) *in eodem*; *(10) *cum sedissem*; (19) *sicut*; (24) *area*; 87 (297, 20) *et exegi ut me*; (20) *instrueret*; 90 (298, 17) *tamen statim*; (18) *suspectus*; 93 (299, 13) *erantum*; 96 (300, 15) *instruere*; 97 (301, 31) *deferantur*; 105 (303, 27) *quiritium*; *113 (306, 3) *in* (printed in italics by Keil); *115 (307, 3) *censoribus*, (4) *ciuitatium*; (7) *nouaremus*; *119 (308, 14) *dandumque* (again Keil trusts Beroaldus rather than Aldus); *120 (309, 10-11) *quasi consulto*; *(11) *quod*; *121 (309, 14) *nec dubitandum fuisset si expectasses*.

in a part of a reading) which Mr. Merrill accepts. Of these Keil had already adopted 22 — a rather decent tribute to Aldus after what Keil had said about the nature of the latter's conjectures.

In 12 readings, *a* and *i* agree in what Mr. Merrill considers error.¹ In a goodly number of cases, *a* and *i* agree in the accepted reading, which is also given by *Ber.* and *Cat.* or both of them against the error of *A*; some of these I have discussed in considering a few of the errors of *A*.² Possibly *a* and *i* are here independently accepting the conjectures of either *Ber.* or *Cat.*, but just as possibly these sagacious critics anticipated the correct reading, found in *P* by *a* and *i*. As there are over 20 cases and as Mr. Merrill allows only a small place for conjecture in *i*, some of these surely must represent the reading of *P*. One rarity is a passage in which *a* and *i* agree in error with *Cat.* in an error.³

Now clearly, to consider merely the 34 cases first mentioned, it is impossible to think that *a* and *i* should independently emend, in some instances solving a most difficult problem successfully, so often as this. Shall we then say that *i* gets the reading by copying *P* while *a* discovers it by conjecture? I hardly think that Mr. Merrill would put Aldus so high a place among conjectural critics. He remarks: ⁴

The reader may, if he choose, accept the text of Aldus in every detail as the *ipsissima verba* of Pliny; but he should recognize the only principle on which he can accept it: it must be as a brilliantly emended text, and not at all as one founded securely upon the following of *Parisinus*, or of any other manuscript source, whenever it departs from extant manuscript tradition.

¹ I will mark with a star those readings which I think should probably have a place in the text. *44 (280, 16) *fungetur*; *52 (282, 17) *confugio*; *76 (292, 26) *quod optimum*; 77 (293, 4) *ut*; *86 B (297, 10) *abunde* (changed by *i*²); *87 (298, 3) *gaudium domine*; 96 (301, 12) *et aerias* (Catanaeus could not penetrate through the error of *A*, but knowing the reading of *P* as shown in *a*, he made the proper emendation at once — and *hetaerias id est sodalitates* is also added by *i* (*i*²?), though Mr. Merrill does not record this fact.); *96 (301, 22) *passimque* (see Döring's note, edition, p. 389); *115 (307, 4) *an legerent*; 116 (307, 19) *diamones*; 118 (308, 9) *iselasian*; 119 (308, 25) *perceperant* (see Hardy's note, edition, p. 235).

² See above pp. 143 ff.

³ 58 (285, 19) *professioni suae A Ber. professione sua ia Cat.* The full phrase is: *Archippum philosophum, bonum uirum et professioni suae etiam moribus respondentem*. But *moribus* is Rittershausen's conjecture for *maioribus*. The latter gives sense; see Longolius's note. If it is read, *professione sua* is necessary.

⁴ C. P., XIV, p. 33.

I infer that Mr. Merrill would regard the notes of Budaeus (although they contain conjectures) as extant manuscript tradition, and therefore admit that Aldus has also drawn from *P.* For Aldus's conjectures, Mr. Merrill has little esteem. In his Teubner edition, he calls them *inutiles* (p. xxiii) or "*saepe frigidas et inutiles*" (p. xiii). I venture to think that he will join me in concluding that in these places, in most of which according to Keil, if his words mean anything,¹ Aldus offered nothing but conjecture, he really, no less than Budaeus, has drawn his good readings from the ancient source. It is exactly the situation that presented itself in Book 8,² only now we do not have another criterion like *M* to make the integrity of Aldus still more patent.

My present statement would be more effective if I could show the quality as well as the quantity of the readings in question. I will select a very few examples.

65 (288, 18) *θρεπτοῦς*] *ια εκθετους* *Cat. om. in lacuna A Ber. al. εκθέ-
τους mg. i*

The Greek was too much for Petrus Leander or his copyist, and he left it out. Avantius and Beroaldus were powerless, but Catanaeus made a brilliant, though erroneous, conjecture, with the opening of the following letter in mind (*liberi nati expositi*). Aldus and Budaeus found the right word in *P.* *Cat.*² at once abandoned his conjecture, though adding in a note: "*Alii legunt εκθέτους.*" Budaeus obviously used *Cat.* (either the first or the second edition) for his marginal variant. Merrill ascribes this to *i*², the difference between *i*¹ and *i*² being clear, I suppose, in the Bodleian volume. In the autograph, it is hard to tell the two apart.³

81 (295, 19) *cui Eumolpus sicut Prusiade*] *cui Eumolpus sic ut Prusiadae a qui Eumolpus sinit Prusiade A qui Eumolpus sicut Prusiade i qui Eumolpo suo Prusiade Ber. cui Eumolpus prius Cat.*

The blunder of *A* (*sinit*) led to a terrific application of the emender's art in *Ber.* and *Cat.* *Prusiade* is difficult, but should be read; see Hardy's

¹ P. xxxvii.

² See *Article I*, pp. 158 ff., 160 ff.

³ At my request, Dr. Lowe has examined in the Bodleian volume all the passages discussed in the present paper, and confirms the impression that I have derived from the rotographs, namely that it is difficult if not impossible to distinguish any of the variants or later additions by *i* (i. e., *i*²). The matter calls for a fresh scrutiny. I have retained *i*² in my citations from Mr. Merrill's *apparatus*, making supplementary remarks wherever appropriate.

note. Aldus may have tried to emend it, and yet the change of *ae* to *e* may have been accidental. *Cui* may be either the reading of *P*, anticipated by Catanaeus, or the conjecture of that scholar retained by Aldus because he found *P* obviously in error. *Cat.*² acknowledges the error of his ways by adopting *sicut* from *a*. He proceeds cheerfully to emend *Prusiade* again, this time, with a reasonable audacity as ever, to *Prusae*. Orelli restores *Prusiade*. Keil returns as near to Avantius as he can with *qui Eumolpus sicut Prusiade*. Merrill rightly follows Hardy in accepting *cui Eumolpus* once more.

90 (298, 17) est tamen statim] *ia Cat.*² est statim tamen *A Ber. Cat.* This is not a reading of grave importance, and yet it shows that in this instance at least, both *a* and *i* had examined *P*, or a copy of it, for a minor detail. It also shows that *Cat.* scanned the Aldine edition with care and tended to follow its authority in matters big and little.

44 (280, 16) remittendo. fungetur his partibus] *Kukula* remittendo. fungetur his partibus *ia* remittendo perpetuo his partibus *A Ber. (Cat.)* remittendo † perpetuo . . . his partibus *Orelli, Keil* Perpetuo providebo his partibus *coni. Orelli*.

This shows the kind of corruption with which *A* had to reckon. He and *Ber.* and even *Cat.* could only throw up their hands. Orelli and Keil would of course have nothing to do with the suspicious conjecture in *a*. *Cat.*² promptly adopted it, and now it is confirmed by *i*, and therefore approved by Mr. Merrill. *Kukula*'s alteration seems to me unnecessary. The Emperor is thinking of the *Byzantiorum res publica* (Pliny's phrase in the preceding letter) collectively. Hardy does well in keeping *fungetur*. This one instance mirrors most of the essential points in the history of the textual criticism of Book 10 of the *Letters*. Perhaps some may be inclined to read the lessons of that history in treating many other passages in which Aldus is still under suspicion.

115 (307, 4) an . . . in senatum aliarum ciuitatum, eiusdem tamen prouinciae ciues] *Keil, Merrill* an in senatum — ciues *A* an in senatum — ciues ascriberentur *Ber. Orelli* an in senatu manere possent aliarum — ciues *Cat.* an legerent in senatum — ciues *ia Cat.*² *Basil. 1530, Froben. 1552, Longolius (Cortius), Gierig.*

This reading presents the same history as does the preceding. Orelli returned to Beroaldus, on account of his erroneous view that Beroaldus preceded Avantius and based his text on a manuscript. No wonder that

Orelli was as disgusted (almost) at Aldus's wanton conjectures as Keil and Merrill are. Not so Catanaeus. He had proposed a most attractive emendation, still further improved by Hardy (*an manere deberent in senatu aliarum* etc.). The language is more explicit than *an legerent*. But the latter phrase suffices, — the Emperor wasted no words — now that we know that it was the reading of *P*. *Cat.*² saw the point at once. Orelli, Keil, and Hardy all acted intelligently, but on the basis of different sorts of misinformation. Just how to explain Mr. Merrill's attitude, I do not see. I would propound again the question asked above on p. 151. Is this an instance of independent conjecture on the part of *a* and *i*? Does the hand of *i* show that it is one of the conjectures added later by him, this time from *a*? I should not so infer from the roto-graph, nor does Mr. Merrill indicate that *legerent* is by *i*². Or did Aldus, after all, take this reading from the Bodleian volume? Surely the simplest hypothesis is that *a* and *i* independently took from *P* a reading which has satisfied all critics, so far as I have observed, down to Orelli.

118 (308, 9) εἰσῆλθσαν] *Cat.* *i*² iselasan *add.* *i*² Iselasan *B* iselasian *ia* Iselasiani *A*

The error of *A* shows not merely the bungling of a Greek word, but a most infelicitous attempt to turn it into a proper name. At the same time, it proceeds from the same text that we see in *ia*, namely that of *P*. *P* is clearly wrong — and Aldus refrains from emending it. The brilliant Catanaeus has divined the truth, as Budaeus recognized. Why *i*² should also write the word in Latin characters is not plain. Perhaps Budaeus himself emended *iselasian*, using Latin characters, before he saw *Cat.* If, as I infer from Dr. Lowe's notes, all the *marginalia* are *i* rather than *i*², Budaeus may have introduced various changes at one sitting, having before him both his copy of *P* and the edition of *Cat.* At any rate, Latin characters were apparently used in *P*. If Aldus, eminent Grecian that he was, had seen Greek in *P*, he would hardly have diluted it. Latin characters were also found in *P* in the following letter (l. 20), it seems to me, *i* using Greek because he saw it in *Cat.*

The above coincidences between *a* and *i* should give pause to any one who is disposed to regard Aldus as a free and easy emender of texts. For a significant number of what were formerly considered rather violent emendations are now proved to have been taken from *P*.

4. The nature of the variants of Budaeus

From the lists just presented, it seems clear that Budaeus had access, whether directly or indirectly, to *P* and that he drew important readings from it. But as Mr. Merrill has said, the variants in the Bodleian volume include a certain number of conjectures. If I may take the statement in his Teubner edition as expressing his matured views on this delicate question, Mr. Merrill believes that Budaeus inspected the *Parisinus* through the kindness of Jucundus, ordered a copy made of the hitherto missing sections of Books 8 and 10, and when this copy had been bound up with his Beroaldus (Books 1-9) and Avantius (10, 41-121) he himself drew about six hundred variants directly from *P*, though he *later* unhappily added certain conjectures from Catanaeus and Aldus.¹ In his chief article on the Bodleian book,² Mr. Merrill mentions three cases of sure conjecture on the part of Budaeus, none of them occurring in the section now under discussion, and calls them later additions. I am not sure whether Mr. Merrill would allow any conjectures among the variants that Budaeus inserted at the time when *P* lay on the table before him; apparently there was no alloy in the gold mined straight from the ancient quarry. The later matter is designated in Mr. Merrill's apparatus as *i*². I suppose, then, that a variant attributed by him to *i* is of the earlier set and strictly pure. If this inference is wrong, I shall be glad to be corrected. Perhaps Mr. Merrill would assume that a few readings of *i* might be conjectural. Some of them certainly look so. I will give a few examples.

48 (281, 15) perpendendi qualia] *Ber. Cat.*² perpendi qualia *Aa*
perpendi enim qualia *Cat. i*.

P had the error *perpendi*, retained by *Aa*; Aldus was not moved either

¹ Teubner edition, pp. xi ff.: *Hoc Budaei exemplar, quod praeter ea supplementa manu librarii scripta, quae modo dixi, sescentis locis manu Budaei ipsius lectionibus ex codice Parisino excerptis (et infeliciter quibusdam aliis post aliquot annos de libris impressis Catanaei et Aldi depromptis) instructum* etc.

² *C. P.*, II, pp. 154: "I take it, then, that most of the readings of *i* were inserted by Budaeus within a short time after he came into possession of them through the agency of Jucundus, but that these three readings [68, 5; 131, 23; 279, 29 Keil] (and, I suspect, some others) that are shown by their writing to have been inserted at a later time, were emendations of his own, added during his later study of the text."

by the good conjecture of *Ber.* or by the bad one of *Cat.* But the latter is among the variants of *i*. If, as Mr. Merrill states and the roto-graph indicates, this is clearly *i* and not *i*², and if the *i*-variants are all of a piece, then the Bodleian book was not put together and revised until the edition of Catanaeus, appearing in 1506, had reached Paris. It would be interesting to know just when Mocenigo brought down the *Parisinus* to Venice. If Budaeus used not *P* itself, but a copy prepared for him by Jucundus, *P* might have been acquired and removed by Mocenigo before Budaeus made up his composite edition of the *Letters*.

65 (288, 18) *θρεττοῦς*]. See above, p. 152. If I am right in thinking that the marginal addition is by *i* and not *i*² we have another bit of evidence in favor of the assumption just raised.

78 (293, 17) *idem . . . fiduciam*] *idem fiduciam A idem petent. fiduciam Ber. Cat. i*

Aldus gives an entirely different reading. Whether or not he is right, the text of *A* is defective and *petent* is *Ber.*'s attempt to fill it. *Cat.* accepted it (reading with *a* in his second edition). He took it for granted, I suppose, that Aldus had found his clear and easy sentence in *P*. I share this confidence, believing that Avantius may have bungled the intelligible in his not infrequent fashion. If Aldus had found *petent* in *P*, it would, I believe, have sufficed him. Either he found what he printed or he found nothing new and ventured a complete remodelling of the text. In either case, *petent* has simply the authority of a conjecture. It would be surprising if Beroaldus could fill in a lacuna, with both the sense and the word, exactly.

In the first part of the same sentence, *Cat.* saw the need of a *si*, and inserted it before *putauerimus* (*Iuliopolitanis succurrendum eodem modo* <*si*> *putauerimus*). Aldus, not finding it in *P*, did not add it. I am inclined to think that we may dispense with it, and construe *putauerimus* paratactically. If it is necessary, Catanaeus's later suggestion immediately appeals, and has been generally if not universally adopted; he puts it at the beginning of the sentence, where, between *habuerimus* and *Iuliopolitanis*, it could readily fall out of the text. We could admit that *A* and *a* might have made such an omission independently. But if this is so, and if Budaeus, scanning *P* for the missing particle, found it there, why does he add it *before putauerimus as in the conjecture of*

Cat.^{1?} He took it from the first edition of *Cat.*, and therefore took *petent* from that source.

86 B (297, 8). Here Budaeus follows *Cat.* in a daring move. The latter not only separated this letter from the preceding but inserted the name of the person in whose interests Pliny is appealing to the Emperor — Fabius Valens, according to *Cat.*, though there is no sign of him in the text of *A* or *a*. We should probably assume a lacuna at this point, but there is no necessity of assuming a new letter. *Cat.* repented in his second edition and destroyed all traces of Fabius Valens; the repentances of *Cat.* as a result of his inspection of *a* are many and profound. They indicate a commendable mixture of acumen and modesty on the part of this free lance among the critics. Now Budaeus, after adding *abunde* in agreement with *a* and therefore *P*, seeing that the lacuna still was gaping, wrote in *Fabium Valentem* and the rest as *Cat.*¹ had it. Mr. Merrill ascribes this addition to *i*²; Dr. Lowe, after examining the passage with great care, would call it *i*.

116 (307, 17) concedendum ius inuitationis *Scheffer* concedendum iussi inuitationes *Ber. Cat. a* concedendum iussi immutationes *A* concedendum iussisti inuitationes *i Budaeus*

This brilliant emendation of Scheffer's has won general approval. *a* preserves the simple error of *P* (a dittography), which *A* by reading *immutationes* had reduced to extreme unintelligibility. Budaeus saw that the first person (*iussi*) was wrong, but he surely had no authority from *P* for the infelicitous conjecture which he introduced.

On the strength of the above cases, I think we should be prepared for a fair amount of conjecture in the variants of *i*. An accepted reading in which *i* agrees with *Ber.* or *Cat.* or both against *Aa* seems to me most probably the conjecture of either of these scholars and not the reading of *P*. Of course, in some cases, such conjectures may have been confirmed by *P*; I have assumed (p. 150) that this is generally the case when they are supported by both *a* and *i*. But feeling sure of Aldus's careful method of collating, I hardly think that if he had found a plausible conjecture of *Cat.* confirmed by *P*, he would have returned to the incorrect reading of *A*. If, then, he agrees with an incorrect reading of *A* instead of accepting an attractive reading in *Cat.*, it is because, — in most cases, at least — he saw that *A* had derived its reading, whatever its nature, from *P*. The attractive reading in *i*,

therefore, agreeing with *Cat.*, would be conjecture. I will examine the relation of *a* to *Cat.* more in detail below.¹ For the present, the appended list contains the good readings of *i* which seem to me taken from the conjectures of *Ber.* or *Cat.*² The case is stronger still if the reading in question is dubious or clearly wrong. I can make a slight addition to the five erroneous conjectures adopted by *i* which I have just discussed.³ The conjectures thus far mentioned are those that *i* has taken from the Pre-Aldine editors. Budaeus does not hesitate to add some of his own; one of them is splendid.⁴

It is, further, most probable that *i* did not catch every reading of importance in *P.* We have noticed that in the text covered by the Morgan fragment his gleanings are exceedingly meagre. Mr. Merrill says well of Budaeus's quotations from the *Letters* in his *Annotiones in xxiv Libros Pandectarum*: "There is no especial consistency in the manner of quotation, and apparently no great worriment about text. Budaeus was quoting Pliny for the subject-matter, and generally concerns himself with text only when the subject-matter is clearly involved."⁵ We should not expect, therefore, to find the text of Avantius collated with *P* as accurately as an editor would think

¹ See pp. 166 f.

² 54 (283, 9) *ociosae*; 57 (284, 26) *quam*; 58 (286, 4) *sint rata* (*i* first wrote in the conjecture of *Cat.* and then changed it to that of *Ber.*); 65 (289, 2) *emendata* (= *Ber. Cat.*); 79 (294, 5) *senatores*; 114 (306, 18) *eaque*; *quae om.* (so according to Mr. Merrill. As a matter of fact, *i* writes the sign '/. above *quae* but adds nothing [so far as I can see] in the margin); 115 (307, 19) *incidere*.

³ 87 (298, 4) *continebis* (obviously the unsuccessful conjecture of *Cat.* and apparently,—so Mr. Merrill—by *i* and not *i*²); 52 (282, 25) *certatim* (conjecture of *Ber.*, perhaps successful, though not in Mommsen's estimation); 121 (309, 16) *esset cum* (conjecture of *Cat.*, successful unless the right reading is in *a*; I cannot make out from the rotograph that *i* has deleted & between *esse* and *cum*).

⁴ 116 (307, 19) *διαρομῆς*; Budaeus should be given the credit for this excellent conjecture rather than Casaubon, whose *Notae in Plinii Epistulas* appeared in 1591. The following attempts at improvement have not been accepted by Mr. Merrill: 92 (299, 7) Greek characters for *eranos*; 96 (300, 17) *aetatum*; 119 (308, 20) *εἰσήλασεν* (*P* hardly had Greek characters here, — see on 308, 9); 120 (309, 9) *hoc uno quem*. In the lemma of 100 (302, 22) *i* deletes *iri* from *A*, but it seems like a remnant of the fuller lemma in *a* (perhaps *Imp.* misunderstood). In 118 (308, 8) *i* marks *iselastici* with a cross as though he questioned the reading (though it is correct); the cross is repeated in the margin, but is unaccompanied by any variant.

⁵ *C. P.*, II, p. 151.

necessary. Budaeus gathered the plums. But some he left hanging. I append a list of some of the acknowledged errors of Avantius that *i* failed to correct.¹

When, therefore, we approach an unsupported variant of Budaeus, whether *i* or *i*², we may not call it forthwith the reading of *P*. It may be, but it may be a conjecture, successful or unsuccessful, by Budaeus himself, or perhaps by Jucundus.

I will begin with six readings approved by Mr. Merrill, and before him by Hardy and by either Keil or Orelli. *i* is the earliest source for these readings. We are to inquire whether he got them from *P*.

41 (279, 9) *eae*] *i* *hae a* *heae A Ber.*

Eae is easily attained by emendation, and, further, I doubt whether it should be read. As *P* had a lacuna just before, we cannot be sure which pronoun is more appropriate.

54 (283.14) *nec sic*] *i* *Orelli* *ne sic Aa Ber. Cat.*

This is an excellent change, and better than *ne si quidem* suggested by *Cat.* and printed by Keil. Mr. Merrill refers to two passages, in which *nec . . . quidem* occurs. One of them is from Book 6 (168, 23 = 171, 16), where the manuscripts and *a* have *nec conueniunt quidem*. Gesner emended *nec* to *ne*, and *i* had anticipated him in making this conjecture. As the manuscripts represent both Class II (*MDoux*) and Class I (*a*), Mr. Merrill is doubtless right in not accepting the conjecture. If, then, *i* is deliberately emending in that passage, it may well be conjecture and not consultation of *P* which accounts for the right reading in the present place.

¹ 41 (279, 18) *operi effectum* (*i* corrected *effectum* but not *operi*); 42 (279, 24) *dimissus*; 43 (280, 15) *qui* (senseless); 55 (283, 20) *qui* (senseless); 56 (283, 26) *qui* ("fortasse recte" according to Mr. Merrill, but not read by him or, to the best of my knowledge, by any editor since *Ber.*); 61 (287, 4) *praestanti* (for *praesenti*); 61 (287, 5) *cuniculo* (for *periculo*); 63 (288, 3, 7, 8) and 67 (19, 22, 25) *Lycorinas* etc. (if *i* had been collating *P*, he ought to have noticed the right spelling of the name in at least one of those six places); 70 (291, 1) *exempla* (for *exemplar*); 71 (291, 8) *ut illud* (nonsense); 84 (296, 23) *Pemellino* (for *Gemellino*); 98 (302, 11) *situ* (for *sicut*); 113 (306, 4) *in* om. (with *a*, *i* had supplied an *in* missing in *A* in the preceding line); 114 (306, 12) *e* om.; (306, 15) *senetu*; 115 (307, 3) *ad te* (for *a te*); 116 (307, 5) *provincia*; 118 (308, 11) *fierent* (for *fieret*); 119 (308, 21) *rerro*; 120 (309, 5) *necessiras*; (7) *te* om.; (11) *sic* add. We may relieve *i* and *A* of one error; in 70 (290, 30) the latter has *eum*, and not, as Mr. Merrill reports, *cum*.

58 (285, 27) ut et] *i* tu tot *A* ut tot *Ber. Cat.* ut et tot *Orelli*
 This is a knotty passage, which Aldus has apparently tried to emend with unhappy results. He omitted the phrase *uel non admonita persuasio*, which may have seemed meaningless, and added *quisque* to make a construction. But the clause *quibus illum intellegi satis est* is by no means clear, nor the contrast well made with it in *spectandus*. Aldus's *qui pusillum intelligit* is so puzzling that I think it may have been just what he found in *P*. It should also be observed that *A* has *intelligis*, not *intelligi* (*i Ber. Cat.*). So has *i* in the margin, though Mr. Merrill does not record that fact. Further, the perfectly clear *ut tot* of *Ber. Cat.*, a ready emendation from *tu tot* of *A*, would hardly have been altered by *a* into *uel libenter*, with disastrous result for the whole sentence, unless he found something in *P* to induce him to make such a change. Again, though *ut tot* — *conferrem* seems entirely satisfactory, its perfection is due to *Ber.*, who changed *conferre* in *A* to *conferrem*. In leaving this neat phrase and returning to *conferre*, *a* indicates, I believe, that this is what he found in *P*. So *ut* could not have been there, but rather, I should infer, *uel libenter*. Whatever he did with the rest of the passage, *a* took *uel libenter noua beneficia conferre* straight from *P*. *A* committed one of his monstrosities in getting *tu tot* out of *uel libenter*, probably abbreviated and hard to read in *A*°. If so, *i* is emending *A* with the help of *Ber. Cat.* and his own good sense.

81 (295, 5) in eodem] *i* in eodem opere *a* in aedem *A* in aede *Ber. Cat.*

Keil had accepted part of *a*, *in eodem*, and now this is supported by *i*. In adding *opere*, *a* apparently has been caught in the act of interpolating. Still, we have seen that *i* is quite capable of noting one correction and missing one in the next word.¹ According to Mr. Merrill's apparatus, we might infer that *i* deleted the following *positam*; but that is not the case.²

102 (303, 8) diem quo in te tutela] *i coni. Gronov* diem quae in tutela *A* diem in quem tutela *Ber. a*

Both Mr. Merrill and Keil fail to note the reading of *Cat.*, a matter of some importance. *Orelli* cites it as agreeing with that of *A*, which

¹ 41 (279, 18) operis effectum] *a Ber. Cat.* operi affectum *A* operi effectum *i*.

² He cites as the reading of *i*, *in eodem*; it should be *in eodem positam*.

does not look like the kind of reading that *Cat.* was wont to let pass. The emendation of *Ber.* satisfied editors until Keil, who adopted the conjecture of Gronov, which now appears in *i*. It seems to me a conjecture there, and an excellent one. If *a* had found anything better in *P* than the reading of *A*, he would have taken it. As it was, he retained the conjecture of *Ber.*, whether or not that had been adopted by *Cat.*

114 (306, 11) dum ne quem earum ciuitatum] *i* (ciuitatum) *Orelli*
dum neque merum ciuitatum *A* dum nequis earum ciuitatum *Ber.*
duntaxat earum ciuitatum *Cat.* (so reported by Keil and Orelli; Mr. Merrill gives *Cat.* as having *duntaxat earum ciuitatum*, which is a misprint for either Mr. Merrill or *Cat.* himself, who must have intended *earum*) dum (dum is omitted by Mr. Merrill) ciuitatis non sint alienae, sed suarum quisque matrum ciuitatum *a*

Here is another passage that looks black for Aldus. He would seem to have found in *P* just what *A* reports (*merum* at any rate, or something like it that suggested *matrum*) and then to have refashioned the whole sentence to give it the meaning which *Cat.* had got in another way and which is apparently the opposite of what Pliny and Trajan say about the right of citizenship in Bithynia according to the *Lex Pompeia*. The matter is by no means clear, though I am inclined to the view just expressed, which is ably presented by Mr. Hardy. Aldus is wrong, therefore, in trying to get from *P* the meaning contained in *Cat.*'s conjecture. But at least he endeavors to utilize the text in *P*, instead of simply accepting *Cat.* If *P* had had the reading of *i*, which, though the *dum* clause lacks a verb, is intelligible enough, I think *a* would have taken what was found there. But *P* was defective in some way, and *a* made an unfortunate effort to improve it. In this case, the accepted reading of *i* is also not the reading of *P*, but a successful conjecture by Budaeus.

I will now consider two new readings of *i* adopted by Mr. Merrill and Mr. Hardy.

65 (288, 23) ad eosdem et Achaeos] *i* *Bud.* ad eosdem acheos *A* *Ber.*
Cat. ad eosdem dein ad Achaeos *a* *Cat.*²

There have been various emendations of this place, including Keil's ejection of the Achaeans altogether. The reading *ad eosdem et acheos* had been known before, as Budaeus has it in his citation from this

letter in his *Annotationes in Pandectas*¹— a good bit of evidence for connecting Budaeus with *i. Cat.* was won over, as we have seen was frequently the case, by *a*, and I think his example should be followed. *Dein* could easily drop out after *dem*, leaving an apparently superfluous *ad* which likewise could disappear in the course of the text from *Parisinus* to *Avantius*. *Et* in *i*, therefore, is conjecture.

113 (306, 6) sed] *i* Rittershausen scilicet *Aa Ber. Cat.*

Not much is accomplished by the change of *scilicet* to *sed*, since *P* is obviously corrupt and defective in this passage. Surely something has fallen from the text here, which various scholars have variously attempted to supply. Whatever should be supplied, *scilicet* seems to have been the reading of *P*.

There remain six readings in which Mr. Merrill, with the help of *i*, prints a new text.

61 (287, 14) fodienda] *i* fienda *A* facienda *Ber. Cat. a*

This is a clever suggestion on the part of *i*. *A*, it would seem, retains an error of *P*. Aldus, finding nothing new there, follows the conjecture of *Ber. Cat.*, for something had to be done with the meaningless *fienda*. As there is a chance, however, that the conjecture of *Ber. Cat.* was actually found by *a* in *P*, but little chance that he would have kept this conjecture if he had found *fodienda*, I think we should retain *facienda*.

67 (289, 26) hinc] *i* hunc *a Ber. Cat.* huic *A*

This reading of *i* is not reported by Hardy but it is surely the addition of that hand. It has little to recommend it, except palaeographical similarity. *Hunc* seems required by the sense, and should be read. Perhaps it was in *P*; perhaps it is merely the conjecture of *Ber. Cat.* But *hinc* is no less conjecture, though a poor one.

70 (290, 31) quem tibi] *i* quae tibi *A Ber.* atque tibi *a* tibi *que Cat. i*²

This is Mr. Merrill's *apparatus*, but, I venture to think, it is incorrect. The reading adopted by Mr. Merrill is not that of *i*. *i* deleted *quae tibi* in *A*, and added *quem uel*, if I read aright from the rotograph; perhaps *quem uelim* was intended, — at least it is not *quem tibi*. If Budaeus wrote *quem uel*, the alteration is infelicitous, improving the gender but making no construction. Mr. Merrill's *quem tibi* is no better. Later, — how much later we do not know — *i* (*i*² according

¹ See Keil, *ad loc.*

to Mr. Merrill) accepted *Cat.*'s conjecture, showing that he was not permanently satisfied with his first attempt at correction. But *Cat.* himself went over to *a* in his second edition, an indication that he collated *a* with considerable care and accepted its authority on even minor points. Again we should imitate this example, as Keil did. *At* could readily have been omitted and the remnant of *atque* read by *A* as *quae*.

119 (308, 23) *quierant*] *i* *qui ierant* *Aa Ber.*

I fail to get the sense of this emendation. The passage is most difficult and has been variously treated. *Qui ierant* of *A* is likewise unintelligible. *Cat.* had conjectured *cum uincerent* and Aldus had reverted from that to *qui ierant*, which he probably found in *P*. The sentence is doubtless corrupt and awaits a happy emendation. That of *i*, accepted by Mr. Merrill, does not seem to me happy.

118 (308, 15) *debeatur*] *i* *debeantur* *Aa Ber. Cat.*

i should be followed if *dandumque* (*ia*) is read. *Debeantur* was in Aldus's basic text and very possibly *P*, as *A* has it. It fits *dandaque* (*Ber. Cat.*) but that is conjecture. *Dandamque* in *A* supports *dandumque*, and therefore *i*'s change to *debeatur* should be accepted, even if it is a successful conjecture and not the reading of *P*.

As a result of this survey, I fail to see that in these new readings of *i*, accepted by Mr. Merrill, we have anything more than the result of conjecture, now felicitous and now less so. There are but two readings of *i* so genuinely antique in character as to suggest that Budaeus may have had *P* or a copy of it before him. One of these I have already discussed (p. 147): 58 (285, 14). Here the phrase *agrum ei ad ·C̄·* seems to come straight from the ancient source, as does the reading of *a*, in spite of his error of *·DC·* for *ad ·C̄·*. Still, I would not rule out the possibility that *a* is right after all and that *i* gets his *ad* with the help of *adderem* in *A*. The other case is also that in which a numeral is concerned: 110 (305, 4). Here *A Ber.* had *quadraginta*, emended by *Cat.* to *quadraginta millia*. Aldus starts with this, and finding it confirmed in *P*, substitutes *·XXXX·*, since in *P* the numeral was not written out, for *quadraginta*. But *i*'s four X's with the stroke above would seem to reproduce even more exactly what was in *P*.¹ And yet, perhaps, Budaeus was capable of writing the numeral in this fashion himself.

¹ As a matter of fact, the stroke covers only the two middle X's. Possibly it was so made in the copy of *P* used by Budaeus.

If, then, there is no reading of *i* indubitably ancient and good that cannot be found in *a*, a horrible possibility presents itself. Were the additions of *i* which accord with Aldus taken not from *P* but from the Aldine edition itself? Mr. Merrill has already allowed, even among the *i*, not the *i*² variants, for some borrowing from Aldus.¹ Can it be that *all* the *i*-variants in this part of the volume are either the conjectures of *Ber. Cat.* or the readings of *a*, whatever the nature of the latter? If this proves to be the case, I can no longer say that *a* has been confirmed by Budaeus. The integrity of Aldus can be defended only on the general principles which I have earlier set forth and on the character of his readings themselves. I am still inclined to the view that the readings which I have listed on pages 150 ff. were taken independently by *a* and *i* from *P*, but if I were asked to prove this view by pointing out indubitable cases of good readings in *i*, not in *a* and not derivable by conjecture, I should have to admit that I cannot lay my hands on evidence of this kind. I would therefore appeal to Mr. Merrill to come to the rescue of Budaeus even though this rescue incidentally involve that of Aldus.

For the moment, however, I will assume, as heretofore, that a goodly number of significant readings in *i* comes directly from *P*, whether at one or more removes, though I allow a larger place among them to conjecture than Mr. Merrill apparently would admit. I am even inclined to believe that Budaeus may never have seen the *Parisiensis* at all. He never says that he did. What he does say corresponds to the condition of his text as I see it in the Bodleian volume. I refer to the note written in the hand of Budaeus at the end of the text of Avantius:²

hae plinii iunioris epistolae ex uetustissimo exemplari parisiensi et restitutae et emendatae sunt opera et industria ioannis iucundi praestantissimi architecti hominis imprimis antiquarii.

From these words it is plain that Budaeus knew of the discovery of *P* by Jucundus, and that the latter with its help had restored and improved the current text of the *Letters*. As Budaeus does not state

¹ Teubner edition, p. XII and cf. also the *apparatus* for 96 (301, 10) *coeundi*; 119 (308, 25) *perceperant*.

² *C. P.*, II, p. 136. Correctly copied by Mr. Merrill, except that Budaeus has *praestantissimi* (with ligature of *ae*), not *prestantissimi*.

that he himself had seen and used the old codex, it is safe to infer, I believe, only that he availed himself of a copy sent him by Jucundus. Mr. Hardy thought that the variants in the Bodleian volume were by Jucundus. That Mr. Merrill has disproved. Therefore the copy prepared by Jucundus for Budaeus is not the Bodleian volume but its source, the text that I have called *I*^o. For this portion of the text, Jucundus may have taken one of the printed editions, not necessarily in Avantius — and collated it with *P*; among the volumes that he sent to Aldus there were, as the latter states in his preface, certain printed editions collated with manuscripts. He may not have made an absolutely complete collation in this part of Book 10, and Budaeus may not have appropriated all the readings which Jucundus had entered in *I*^o. And some of these readings may well have been the private conjectures of Jucundus.

One error of *A* that *i* failed to correct is perhaps important to note at this point.

72 (291, 13) agnoscendis] *a Budaeus Cat.*² cognoscendis *A Ber. Cat.* *i* does not correct *cognoscendis*, but Budaeus does, in his quotation of this passage in his *Annotationes in Pandectas*. How shall we account for this state of affairs? After Mr. Merrill's proof, one can hardly deny that the Bodleian volume was put together by Budaeus. Did he make an emendation in the act of copying out this passage for his printed work? He was capable of so doing. Perhaps, however, he used for this work the material that I call *I*^o, which may have been lent to him by Jucundus and returned at some later time after it had been utilized, — but not exhaustively utilized — for what to-day is the Bodleian volume.

As for Budaeus, then, whatever the relation of *i* to the Aldine text, we cannot conclude either that all of its variants, except a few later conjectures, are those of *P*, or that Budaeus reports all the variants that there are. He may be an independent witness to the ancient codex. Even so, though he tells the truth, he does not necessarily tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

5. *The amount of conjecture in the Aldine text*

The damaging verdict passed by Keil and Mr. Merrill on Aldus has been somewhat alleviated by the confirmation which some of his

readings have gained by the discovery of the Bodleian volume. And even should it prove that *i* is not independent of *a*, at least I can point to the acceptance of these Aldine readings by the latest Teubner editor of the *Letters*. I will also refer to 9 readings where *a* is followed either by Keil or by Mr. Merrill (whatever they consider the nature of its readings), although it is not backed up by *i*.¹ It would seem to me, after my study of Aldus's temperament and habits, that these good readings are not the result of private conjecture but were taken by Aldus from his ancient book. It is possible also to illustrate his conservative tendencies in another way. Beroaldus and Catanaeus, as we have seen, had done their best at conjectural emendation of the corrupt text of Avantius. In some cases, they had doubtless struck the truth, perhaps now and then going back of an error which *A* had copied from *P*. But in a surprising number of cases, *a* rejects these innovations and retains the reading of *A*, whether that is right or wrong.

To estimate the exact amount of this reaction, we should discover, if we can, which of the existing editions he used as a basis for collation. Although it is hard to acquire certain evidence in a matter of this kind, it seems most probable that the edition which Aldus so used was that of Catanaeus. That would be a natural enough proceeding, in view of the obvious errors of Avantius. *Cat.* was the latest text, and though disfigured by conjectures as that of *A* was by blunders, it would always present something readable, something on which to fall back in case the ancient manuscript was obviously wrong. The appended readings, in which Aldus agrees with Catanaeus, seem to bear out this probability. They will be found to contain several insignificant errors, like *se esse* for *esse se*, 96 (300, 29), which are of just the sort that an editor might overlook in the act of collating.² In any event, it is clear that Aldus was familiar with the edition of Catanaeus.

¹ 56 (284, 9) *datumque*; 58 (285, 10) *te*; 63 (288, 3, 8, 9), 67 (289, 19, 22, 25) *Lycormas* etc.; 66 (289, 13) *uindicabuntur*; 68 (290, 7) *obseruare*; 70 (291, 3) *eiusdem*; 81 (295, 9) *petiit*; (10) *si. om.*; 90 (298, 26) *suspectum* (cf. 18). To this list I feel like adding 104 (303, 22) *Aper*, accepted by Kortte and Hardy.

² Readings accepted by Keil or Mr. Merrill are starred. 41 (279, 9) *sed*; 57 (282, 24) *perseuerauerit*; 58 (285, 1) *non modo*; *(7) *et*; *61 (287, 13) *effundet*; *70 (291, 1) *exemplar*; *(2) *Polyaenum*; *(8) *uti. illud*; *78 (293, 12) *in eam*; 80 (294, 19) *idem*; 96 (300, 29) *se esse*; 108 (304, 21) *contingat*; *110 (305, 4) *mil(l)ia*;

In view of this fact, Aldus's numerous rejections of the conjectures of Catanaeus, some very tempting, if one is a professional emender, and some accepted by editors to-day, are noteworthy. I append a list which, though by no means complete, is sufficiently illustrative for my purpose. In all these cases, *a* reverts to what would seem to be the text of *P*.¹

In general, I think I can see the same Aldus at work whose habits I have illustrated in examining the recovered letters of Book 8. When, therefore, in the present section of text, we note about 20 instances in which *a* exhibits minor changes and about 28 in which it inserts minor words not found in Avantius or his successors, including *i*, we may recall a similar list in Book 8, in which 38 Aldine readings, many of them not accepted by Keil because not found in *M*, have been validated by the discovery of *I*.² The proportion of these divergent readings is certainly not greater than we should expect, for the stretch of text in Book 8 covers but 12 pages of Kukula's edition, and that in Book 10, after subtracting the headings, is about 30. Now as several of the omissions of *M* include not merely words but phrases, I feel that a few of the longer additions in the latter half of Book 10 may

113 (306, 7) *erogatio*; *115 (307, 3) *ensoribus*. It may be, of course, that some of the correct readings were divined by *Cat.*, and confirmed by *a* from *P*. The coincidence in error is the more significant.

¹ In all cases the reading not specified is that of *Cat.* and in all cases, the reading of *a*, unless otherwise stated, agrees with that of *A*. 41 (279, 7) *modico*] *immodico a*; 50 (282, 13) *adfinem eius*] *ad finem eius a ad finem eius consulatus*; 51 (282, 16) *nec*] *a non*; (17) *quamuis maxime possim*] *A quamuis Maximo possum a quamuis maxime debeam* (here *a* draws from *P*, though inadvisably making a proper name of *Maximo*. Mommsen's brilliant conjecture should be accepted.); 54 (283, 9) *quae*] *a quas*; 56 (284, 12) *negauit*] *om. a*; (*negauit* seems indispensable — if Aldus had a passion for interpolation he doubtless would have not objected to this one); 58 (285, 11) *sunt*] *a sicut*; 61 (287, 6) *adduci*] *a deduci*; 62 (287, 28) *usus*] *a usu*; 71 (291, 7) *domu*] *a domo*; 75 (292, 13) *scilicet*] *a sed*; (13) *credit*] *Ber. credit Aa* (this should be read) *credens*; 76 (292, 26) *insequere*] *a inquire*; 77 (293, 9) *commeantibus*] *a commeatoribus*; 78 (293, 21) *uersus*] *a om. Cat.*; 81 (295, 8-9) *in alia ciuitate*] *in aliam ciuitatem a*; 96 (300, 20) *cohaerentia*] *i Ber. Cat. cohaerenti Aa* (error of *P*); 100 (302, 27) *obsequio*] *Ber. obsequi Aa consequi Cat.*; 98 (302, 13) *eam*] *ea Aa* (this should be read); 116 (307, 19) *incidere*] *incipere Aa (= P)*; 118 (308, 8) *iselastici*] *a Iselasticorum*; (*ibid.*) *itaque eorum*] *a ita tamen ut* (another free handling of the text that *a* did not approve).

² See *Article I*, pp. 160 ff.

well be the genuine reading of *P*. When we find Aldus, for instance, making such radical alterations of the text of *A* as *emi iuberem* for *tam uberem*, or *fungetur* for *perpetuo*,¹ and then see that these very changes are confirmed by the testimony of *i*, we have a right to infer that at least some of his other changes, violent though they now appear, were based on the evidence of *P*. In some cases I will admit, as I have always admitted, that Aldus may have found a palpable error in *P* and have done his best to remove it. I append a list of cases, some less² and some more³ serious, in which it seems to me likely that *a* has deviated from his general practice and resorted, with no happy result, to emendation. Aldus does not shine as a conjectural restorer of texts. In a few cases, some of which we have noted, he retains, sometimes deliberately, sometimes accidentally, the errors or conjectures of Catanaeus. I count about six mistakes that may be charged to the compositor. This record is not particularly black.

I hope that the nature of my argument is plain to the reader, and that he will not charge me with pronouncing a ukase when I have meant to suggest a possibility. Some of my estimates of the reading of *P* and of Aldus's use of that manuscript may well deserve revision. But what I have proved, I believe, is that the conjectures of Aldus cannot be discovered by the simple method of noting his discrepancies with the Bodleian volume. The text of Avantius is not a good criterion; it is marred not only by serious scribal errors but by attempts at conjectural emendation. Nor does the text of *A* as improved by *i* enable us to restore with certainty the reading of *P*. Even if we suppose, as is unlikely, that Budaeus drew some of his variants directly from the ancient manuscript, he did not collate it with minute accuracy. Furthermore, his variants undoubtedly include conjectures, — some of them belonging to the original set — which he either invented or took from Catanaeus or, now and then, from Aldus. Therefore the equation $A + i = P$ falls very far short of demonstration. I prefer to depend, rather, on what I have shown to be Aldus's editorial principles, on his reverence for ancient texts, and to assume that he

¹ See above pp. 147, 153.

² 63 (288, 5) *sed*; 81 (295) *ad adstruendam* (though possibly in *P*); 96 (301, 22) *uictimas quarum* (?).

³ 58 (285, 25) *quibus illum*, etc. (*a* in part returns to *P* and in part emends) (286, 5) *nec qui* etc.; 114 (306 *dum ne ciuitatis*) etc.

would refrain from conjecture unless the condition of the text of *P* seemed clearly to require it. With the exception of the readings recorded in the two footnotes just given, I would accept the entire Aldine text in the latter portion of Book 10. Whatever modification of details may prove necessary, I am convinced that I can apply my former statement¹ to the text that we have just examined, and after our inspection of *Avantius* and of *i*, conclude that here, too, the Aldine edition, not the Bodleian volume, is our most trustworthy witness to the text of the ancient *Codex Parisinus* of Pliny's *Letters*.

¹ Carnegie publication, p. 65.

SUMMARIES OF DISSERTATIONS FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D., 1923-24

WARREN E. BLAKE. — *De Menandri Ironia*

IN this dissertation, "irony" is considered primarily with a view to its functions as a dramatic device. Owing, however, to the rather vague and disconnected notions associated with the term, it was thought necessary in the first chapter to review the more important aspects of irony and to attempt to reduce them all to a single system from which some underlying principle might be derived as a basis for our consideration of Menander's practice. That underlying principle we have defined objectively as a situation wherein a human being in the more or less active exercise of his will comes into opposition with an obstacle of which he is unaware, and by his blind persistence in his initial purpose exhibits to an appreciative audience a striking inadequacy or unsuitableness of his means. In other words, in every ironical situation, and therefore in every dramatic representation thereof, there are present actually or implicitly to a greater or less degree these four elements:

1. A human will in operation;
2. An obstacle opposed to the means of the will;
3. Ignorance of the victim concerning the true state of affairs;
4. An informed, appreciative audience.

When all four elements are present independently with nearly equal prominence the resulting irony is most striking. Such is the so-called "irony of Fate" and its reproduction on the stage.

In the somewhat less effective "irony of deceit," we see the first element subordinated in importance and the second and fourth as it were consolidated. The conflict then is no longer between the will of the victim and circumstance, but between two wills, one of which is unconscious of the conflict.

Finally in the "irony of expression", whereby a man "sayeth a thing and giueth to understand the contrarie", we have all the elements united in a single person who for reasons of his own *imitates* a truly ironic situation. This last type of simulated irony is excluded from

our consideration except in so far as it is used as a device to point or prolong an instance of true irony.

There follows a brief chapter on the nature of our materials and a review of the Plautine and Terentian adaptations of Menander's originals.

In the third chapter we examine our material according to the plan indicated above and classify the ironical passages first according to the degree of activity of the will of the victim.

Next in the consideration of the obstacles which create ironical situations we make a broad division between those which are of spontaneous origin, i.e., which are not the result of deliberate human agency, and those which are merely elaborated deceptions. In the former class, besides those which arise from the unforeseen results of anterior circumstance, we have discovered a prominent type of irony-producing obstacle which arises from some unappreciated trait of character in the nature of the victim himself. This occurs frequently in conjunction with other complications in the plot and thus forms an important part of Menander's dramatic technique whereby he joins character-drawing and plot. In the latter class are listed the common means of deceit such as lies, forgeries, and impersonations, and other more involved methods of deceit which produce ironic results.

Finally we turn from the situation itself to the technical devices by which it is revealed to the audience. Such consist in the declaration of the true state of affairs either unconsciously by the victim himself, or consciously in ambiguous terms by another person.

ALEXANDER DAVID FRASER. — *The Greek Helmet*

THE purpose of this investigation is to gather from all available sources, literary and archaeological, such evidence as may throw light upon the character and the historical sequence of the various types of helmet which were in use among the Greek armies. Owing to the exhaustive nature of the researches of Helbig, Reichel, Lang, and others in the field of Homeric armor and weapons, the starting-point of the enquiry is set no further back than the Dark Ages of Greece; its termination coincides with the beginning of Rome's hegemony.

The introductory chapter contains some notice of ancient literary references to the helmet and an examination of the nature and value of the evidence contained in vase-paintings, reliefs, figurines, gems, coins, mirrors, and statues. Attention is drawn to the merits and demerits of the different types of helmet used by the Greeks in view of the character of Hellenic warfare and the weapons of attack which were used. There is likewise an attempt made to differentiate the actual service helmet from the styles used in parades.

In the classification of types, the traditional terms "Attic" and "Corinthian" are retained. The latter style is, however, subdivided into three classes: (a) Proto-Corinthian, or Diomedean, (b) Corinthian proper, and (c) Late Corinthian. The first and the last of these have not hitherto been distinguished from the second. The question of the so-called Boeotian helmet is discussed at some length, and it is shown that this was not a distinct type, but rather a well-known style which was perfected in Boeotian workshops in the time of Xenophon. (An elaboration of this section has been published in *The Art Bulletin*, IV, 3, 1922, pp. 99-108.) Minor types, the pileus, and foreign helmets that manifest Greek influence are also given consideration.

In the concluding chapters, which treat of the various parts of the Greek casque, three distinct styles of crest are noted: (a) the low, (b) the lofty, (c) the Italic, or Graeco-Apulian. The statement of Herodotus that the Carians were the inventors of this feature is examined in detail, and it is argued that the invention of the "low" type only is to be credited to this people.

JOHN JOSEPH SAVAGE. — *De Scholiis in Turonensi Vergili Codice Scriptis*

THE aim of this dissertation is to examine the scholia in the Tours manuscript of Virgil (*Bernensis* 165) in order to throw some light on the origin of the compilation of scholia known as the enlarged Servius (*Servius auctus*). Following Thilo, the most recent editor of Servius, I state the reasons why this manuscript should be selected for special study. The manuscripts used by Thilo and those used by Daniel in his *editio princeps* of *Servius auctus*, are next enumerated, to show the relation of the Tours scholia both to the text of the *Servius auctus* and to that of the so-called Berné scholia on Virgil, some of

which are contained in the *Turonensis*. Then follows a brief review of the theories which the editors just mentioned and scholars like Émile Thomas and Karl Barwick have presented to account for the form in which *Servius auctus* has been preserved in the manuscripts. I endeavor to test these theories in the light of a more critical study of the Tours scholia. The manuscripts utilized in the present study, besides the *Turonensis*, are *Parisinus* 7959, *Parisinus* 7930, *Montepessulanus* 253, *Bernensis* 363. I have made a first-hand study of all these manuscripts, besides having before me photographic representations of the entire Tours codex.

I next discuss the various hands represented in the Tours scholia and the character of the interpretations that I would assign to each. In the *Bucolics* and *Georgics*, I have distinguished four different scholiasts, three of whom also write marginal scholia to the text of the *Aeneid*. Besides these I have distinguished two other scholiasts who seem to have confined their notes to the *Bucolics* and *Georgics*.

The sources of the scholia to the *Bucolics* and *Georgics* and to the *Aeneid* are then discussed. Two points are brought out: (1) the extensive use made of Nonius by one of the scholiasts, especially in the interpretation of words found in the *Georgics*; (2) positive evidence that the commentary of Aelius Donatus was the immediate or the remote source of several scholia. In treating the scholia on the *Aeneid*, I have devoted especial attention to those on the first two books, inasmuch as these have been unduly neglected by scholars. It appears, as a result of this analysis, that the actual citations of Donatus are made by only one of the scholiasts.

In my final chapter I have brought forward parallels between the last-mentioned scholiast and the extant fragments of Donatus. One instance I have noted where the interpreter undoubtedly depended for his information neither on Servius nor on *Servius auctus* but on a source common to both of these. Judging from the strong evidence of a tradition peculiar to Donatus found elsewhere in this scholiast, who, as I have noted in an appendix, shows the influence of the school of Johannes Scottus (fl. 850), I have concluded that the commentary of Donatus was very probably in the hands of at least one of the writers of the Tours scholia.

GENERAL INDEX

- Aldus, Manutius, 137-167 *passim*.
 conjectures in his text of Pliny
 (*Epist.* 10, 41-121), 151 ff., 167.
 estimates of his editorial methods,
 138 ff., 167.
 more trustworthy witness to text
 than Budaeus or Avantius, 169.
 relation of his text to that of Ca-
 tanaeus, supported by Budaeus
 in novel readings, 150 ff.
 "Ambrosius Painter," 129 f.
- Avantius,
 his text of Pliny (*Epist.* 10, 41-121),
 142 ff.
 emendations, 146 ff.
 errors, 144 ff.
- Barwick, C., 7.
- BLAKE, W. E., *De Menandri Ironia*, 171-
 172.
- Budaeus (*see* Aldus).
- Chachrylion, connection with other mas-
 ters, 116-118.
 style of, 111-116, 134-136.
 vases attributed to, 118-134.
 vases signed by, 85-111.
- Chelis, 83, 88, 116.
- Cicero,
actio, 30.
ἐκλογή ὀνομάτων, 25.
elocutio, 23 f.
ἦθος and *πάθος*, 33.
imitatio, 36.
 indebtedness to Plato, 9, 15, 20,
 58 f.
 inspiration *versus* training, 70-72.
inventio, 21.
- liberal training, 53-55, 67, 69.
 metaphors, 27.
officium oratoris, 62.
officium poetae, 61.
Orator compared to Horace, *Ars*
Poetica, 1-74 (*see* summaries, 9,
 20 f., 73 f.).
ordo, 22.
poeta demens, 50, 72.
 prosody, 29.
 sound of words, 28.
 the perfect poet, 45.
 the three rhetorical styles, 38.
τὸ πρέπον, 20.
tractatio, 60.
 wit and humor, 45.
 works of art, 19.
- Douris, 79, 83, 92, 115.
- ἐγραψεν and ἐποίησεν on vases, interpre-
 tation of, 76 ff., 134 f.
- ELDERKIN, KATE MCKNIGHT, Cha-
 chrylion and his Vases, 75-136.
- Epidromos καλός, 118, 120 f.
- Epiktetos, 79, 81, 82, 83, 86, 92, 116,
 117, 118, 134.
- Euphronios, 77 f., 81, 83, 93, 97, 105,
 108, 109, 115, 116, 118, 130,
 131 f.
- Euthymides, 92, 117, 123.
- Euxitheos, 116.
- FISKE, GEORGE CONVERSE, and MARY
 A. GRANT. Cicero's *Orator* and
 Horace's *Ars Poetica*, 1-74.
- FRASER, ALEXANDER DAVID, The Greek
 Helmet, 172-173.

GRANT, MARY A. See FISKE, GEORGE
CONVERSE.

Hambidge, theories of, 81, 135.

Heracleides, 68.

"Hermaios Painter," 75, 85.

Hack, R. K., 5, 16.

Horace (*see* Cicero).

relation to *genus tenue*, 26, 29, 42.

to *genus medium*, 63.

Isocrates, 66.

Jensen, C., 4, 6.

καλός-names, interpretation of, 82 f.

Kleophrades, 78.

Kroll, W., 6.

Leagros *καλός*, 82 f., 108, 110, 116, 118,
128, 131 ff.

Memnon *καλός*, 82 f., 88, 90, 116.

Meredith, George, 74.

Merrill, E. T., 137-169 *passim*.

Neoptolemus, 68.

Norden, E., 5, 16, 47, 69.

Oltos, 77, 84, 89, 94, 116.

Onesimos, 78 f.

Pamphaios, 119.

"Panaitios Painter," 132 ff

Pasiades, 81.

Philodemus, 4, 6, 13.

Phintias, 83, 117, 123.

Plato (*see* Cicero).

Pliny (*see* Aldus), 137-169 *passim*.

RAND, E. K. A New Approach to the
text of Pliny's *Letters*, Article II,
137-169.

Rhetorical styles, the three, 26, 39,
42 f., 63.

SAVAGE, J. J., *De Scholiis in Turo-
nensi Vergili Codice Scriptis*, 173-
174.

Sotades, 81.

HARVARD STUDIES

IN

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of
Harvard University.

PUBLISHED BY THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I, 1890.

- The Fauces of the Roman House. — *By James B. Greenough.*
De Ignis Eliciendi Modis apud Antiquos. — *Scriptis Morris H. Morgan.*
On the Origin of the Construction of οὐ μὴ with the Subjunctive and the Future Indicative. — *By William W. Goodwin.*
On Some Disputed Points in the Construction of εἴδει, χρῆν, etc., with the Infinitive. — *By William W. Goodwin.*
Notes on Quintilian. — *By George M. Lane.*
Some Latin Etymologies. — *By James B. Greenough.*
On *egregium publicum* (Tac. Ann. 3, 70, 4). — *By Clement L. Smith.*
On the Use of the Perfect Infinitive in Latin with the Force of the Present. — *By Albert A. Howard.*
Plutarch περὶ εὐθυμίας. — *By Harold N. Fowler.*
Vitruviana. — *By George M. Richardson.*
The Social and Domestic Position of Women in Aristophanes. — *By Herman W. Hayley.*
Notes. Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II, 1891.

- Quaestiones Petronianae. — *Scriptis Herman W. Hayley.*
Greek and Roman Barbers. — *By F. W. Nicolson.*
Some Constructions in Andocides. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*
Gajus or Galus? — *By Frederic D. Allen.*
An Inscribed Kotylos from Boeotia. — *By John C. Rolfe.*
Nedum. — *By J. W. H. Walden.*
Some Uses of *Neque (Nec)* in Latin. — *By James B. Greenough.*
The Participial Construction with *τυγχάνειν* and *κυρεῖν*. — *By J. R. Wheeler.*
The 'Stage' in Aristophanes. — *By J. W. White.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME III, 1892.

- The Date of Cylon. — *By John Henry Wright.*
Catullus and the Phaselus of his Fourth Poem. — *By Clement L. Smith.*
On the Homeric Caesura and the Close of the Verse as related to the Expression of Thought. — *By Thomas D. Seymour.*
On the Notion of Virtue in the Dialogues of Plato, with particular reference to those of the First Period and to the Third and Fourth Books of the Republic. — *By William A. Hammond.*
Notes. Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IV, 1893.

- The *Ἀδλός* or Tibia. — *By Albert A. Howard.*
 The Tragedy Rhesus. — *By John C. Rolfe.*
 The Use of *Hercle* (*Mehercle*), *Edepol* (*Pol*), *Ecastor* (*Mecastor*), by Plautus and Terence. — *By Frank W. Nicolson.*
 Accentual Rhythm in Latin. — *By James B. Greenough.*
 On the Omission of the Subject-Accusative of the Infinitive in Ovid. — *By Richard C. Manning.*
 Latin Etymologies. — *By James B. Greenough.*
 On *πεῖραρ ἐλέσθαι* (Σ 501) and the *Manus Consertio* of the Romans. — *By Frederic D. Allen.*
Herondaea. — *By John Henry Wright.*
 Notes. Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME V, 1894.

- Stage-Terms in Heliodorus's *Aethiopica*. — *By J. W. H. Walden.*
 Notes on the *Bacchae* of Euripides. — *By Mortimer Lamson Earle.*
 Notes on Lysias. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*
 Early Latin Prosody. — *By James B. Greenough.*
 The *κότταβος κατακτός* in the Light of Recent Investigations. — *By Herman W. Hayley.*
De Scholiis Aristophaneis Quaestiones Mythicae. — *Scriptis Carolus Burton Gulick.*
H as a Mute in Latin. — *By E. S. Sheldon.*
 Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI, 1895.

- The Opisthodomus on the Acropolis at Athens. — *By John Williams White. With Plate.*
Artemis Anaïtis and Mên Tiamu, A Votive Tablet in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. — *By John Henry Wright. With Plate.*
 The Date of Lycophron. — *By William N. Bates.*
Quo modo Iaciendi Verbi Composita in Praesentibus Temporibus Enuntiauerint Antiqui et Scripserint. — *Quaerit Mauricius W. Mather.*
 Homeric Quotations in Plato and Aristotle. — *By George Edwin Howes.*
 Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VII, 1896.

The articles in this volume are contributed by former pupils and colleagues of Professor George Martin Lane, in commemoration of the happy completion of fifty years since he received his first degree in Arts from Harvard College.

- On the Extent of the Deliberative Construction in Relative Clauses in Greek. — *By William W. Goodwin.*
 Some Features of the Contrary to Fact Construction. — *By James B. Greenough.*
 Studies in the Text of Lucretius. — *By William Everett.*
 On '*Os Columnatum*' (Plaut. *M. G.* 211) and Ancient Instruments of Confinement. — *By Frederic D. Allen.*
Cicero's Journey into Exile. — *By Clement Lawrence Smith.*
 Five Interesting Greek Imperatives. — *By John Henry Wright.*
 The Plot of the *Agamemnon*. — *By Louis Dyer.*
Musonius the Etruscan. — *By Charles Pomeroy Parker.*
 Notes on the *Anapaests* of Aischylos. — *By Herbert Weir Smyth.*
 The Dates of the *Exiles* of Peisistratos. — *By Harold N. Fowler.*
Coronelli's Maps of Athens. — *By J. R. Wheeler. With Plate.*
 Notes on Persius. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*
 Notes on Suetonius. — *By Albert A. Howard.*
Varia Critica. — *By Herman W. Hayley.*
 A Point of Order in Greek and Latin. — *By J. W. H. Walden.*
 Omens and Augury in Plautus. — *By Charles Burton Gulick.*
 Syllabification in Roman Speech. — *By William Gardner Hale.*
 Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XI (continued).

Notes on the Worship of the Roman Emperors in Spain. — *By George Converse Fiske.*
Συγγενής Ὀφθαλμός. — *By Josiah Bridge.*
Ancient Roman Curb Bits. — *By Robert Emmons Lee.*
Notes on the Phormio. — *By H. W. Hayley.*
Epigraphica. — *By Minton Warren.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XII, 1901.

The articles in this volume are contributed by former pupils and colleagues of Professor William Watson Goodwin, in commemoration of the happy completion of fifty years since he received his first degree in Arts from Harvard College, and of forty-one years since he became Eliot Professor.

On Ellipsis in some Latin Constructions. — *By J. B. Greenough.*
Catullus *vs.* Horace. — *By William Everett.*
A Preliminary Study of certain Manuscripts of Suetonius' Lives of the Caesars. — *By Clement Lawrence Smith.*
Iambic Composition of Sophocles. — *By Isaac Flagg.*
Tzetzes's Notes on the *Aves* of Aristophanes in Codex Urbinas 141. — *By John Williams White.*
The Origin of Subjunctive and Optative Conditions in Greek and Latin. — *By Wm. Gardner Hale.*
Unpublished Scholia from the Vaticanus (C) of Terence. — *By Minton Warren.*
Studies in Sophocles. — *By John Henry Wright.*
Plato as a Playwright. — *By Louis Dyer.*
Lucianea. — *By Francis G. Allinson.*
Musonius in Clement. — *By Charles Pomeroy Parker.*
Plato, Lucretius, and Epicurus. — *By Paul Shorey.*
The Origin of the Statements contained in Plutarch's Life of Pericles, Chapter XIII. — *By Harold N. Fowler.*
Notes on the so-called Capuchin Plans of Athens. — *By J. R. Wheeler.*
Miscellanea. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*
The Preposition *Ab* in Horace. — *By John C. Rolfe.*
Notes on a Fifteenth Century Manuscript of Suetonius. — *By Albert A. Howard.*
The Antigone of Euripides. — *By James M. Paton.*
The Use of *μή* with the Participle where the Negative is Influenced by the Construction upon which the Participle Depends. — *By George Edwin Howes.*
Notes on the Tragic Hypotheses. — *By Clifford Herschel Moore.*
An Observation on the Style of S. Luke. — *By James Hardy Ropes.*
The Use of *μή* in Questions. — *By Frank Cole Babbitt.*
Notes on the Old Temple of Athena on the Acropolis. — *By William Nickerson Bates.*
On the Greek Infinitive after Verbs of Fearing. — *By Charles Burton Gulick.*
Argos, Io, and the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus. — *By Joseph Clark Hoppin.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIII, 1902.

The Politics of the Patrician Claudii. — *By George Converse Fiske.*
The Shield Devices of the Greeks. — *By George Henry Chase.*
A Study of the Danaid Myth. — *By Campbell Bonner.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIV, 1903.

This volume is dedicated to the memory of Professor James Bradstreet Greenough, through whose efforts the publication fund was secured, and to whom, in large measure, the success of the Studies is due.

James Bradstreet Greenough (with Portrait). — *By George Lyman Kittredge.*
Observations on the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil. — *By W. Warde Fowler.*
The Illustrated Terence Manuscripts. — *By Karl E. Weston.*
The Relation of the Scene-Headings to the Miniatures in Manuscripts of Terence. — *By John Calvin Watson.*
Indexes. Plates.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV, 1904.

- On the Composition of Boethius' *Consolatio Philosophiae*. — *By Edward Kennara Rand.*
Notes on some Uses of Bells among the Greeks and Romans. — *By Arthur Stanley Pease.*
The Nemesis of the Younger Cratinus. — *By Edward Capps.*
Some Phases of the Cult of the Nymphs. — *By Floyd G. Ballentine.*
De Comiciis Graecis Litterarum Iudiciis. — *Quaesivit Guilielmus Wilson Baker.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVI, 1905.

- A Preliminary Study of Certain Manuscripts of Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*: Second Paper. — *By Clement Lawrence Smith.*
The Dramatic Art of Aeschylus. — *By Chandler R. Post.*
An Examination of the Theories Regarding the Nature and Origin of Indo-European Inflection. — *By Hanns Oertel and Edward P. Morris.*
The Use of the High-Soled Shoe or Buskin in Greek Tragedy of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. — *By Kendall K. Smith.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVII, 1906.

The articles in this volume are contributed by instructors in the Department of the Classics as a token of affection and esteem for Clement Lawrence Smith, of the class of 1863, for thirty-four years a valued member of the Department, but forced by ill health to resign the Pope Professorship of Latin in this University in 1904.

- Notes on Vitruvius. — *By Morris H. Morgan*
Catullus and the Augustans. — *By Edward Kennard Rand.*
On Five New Manuscripts of the Commentary of Donatus to Terence. — *By Minton Warren.*
On the Origin of the Taurobolium. — *By Clifford Herschel Moore.*
Aspects of Greek Conservatism. — *By Herbert Weir Smyth.*
The Battle of Salamis. — *By William W. Goodwin.*
An Unrecognized Actor in Greek Comedy. — *By John Williams White.*
The Origin of Plato's Cave. — *By John Henry Wright.*
An Amphora with a New *Kalós*-Name in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. — *By George Henry Chase.*
Sacer intra Nos Spiritus. — *By Charles Pomeroy Parker.*
Valerius Antias and Livy. — *By Albert A. Howard.*
Indexes. Plates.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVIII, 1907.

- 'Logaoedic' Metre in Greek Comedy. — *By John Williams White.*
The Medea of Seneca. — *By Harold Loomis Cleasby.*
Boyhood and Youth in the Days of Aristophanes. — *By Arthur Alexis Bryant.*
Stylistic Tests and the Chronology of the Works of Boethius. — *By Arthur Patch McKinlay.*
The Manuscript Tradition of the *Acharnenses*. — *By Earnest Cary.*
Note on the Battle of Pharsalus. — *By Arthur Searle.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIX, 1908.

- The Olympian Council House and Council. — *By Louis Dyer.*
The Propitiation of Zeus. — *By Joseph William Hewitt.*
The Authorship and the Date of the Double Letters in Ovid's *Heroides*. — *By Sereno Burton Clark.*
The Use of *ἀλιτήριος*, *ἀλιτρός*, *ἀραῖος*, *ἐναγής*, *ἐνθύμιος*, *παλαμναῖος*, and *προστρόπαιος*: A Study in Greek Lexicography. — *By William Henry Paine Hatch.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XX, 1909.

- Latin Inscriptions in the Harvard Collection of Classical Antiquities. — *By Clifford H. Moore.*
Classical Elements in Browning's *Aristophanes' Apology*. — *By Carl Newell Jackson.*
A List of Text-Books from the Close of the Twelfth Century. — *By Charles H. Haskins.*
The Development of Motion in Archaic Greek Sculpture. — *By Chandler Rathfon Post.*
An Emendation of Vitruvius. — *By C. A. R. Sanborn.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXI, 1910.

- Critical and Explanatory Notes on Vitruvius. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*
Magistri Scriniorum, ἀντιγραφῆς, and βεβερενδάριοι. — *By J. B. Bury.*
Three *Puer*-Scenes in Plautus, and the Distribution of Rôles. — *By Henry W. Prescott*
A Harvard Manuscript of St. Augustine. — *By Arthur Stanley Pease.*
The Sicilian Translators of the Twelfth Century and the First Latin Version of Ptolemy's *Almagest*. — *By Charles H. Haskins and Dean Putnam Lockwood.*
On a Passage in Pindar's Fourth Nemean Ode. — *By Charles E. Whitmore.*
The *Oresteia* of Aeschylus as Illustrated by Greek Vase-Painting. — *By Hetty Goldman.*
Doctors of Philosophy in Classical Philology and Classical Archaeology of Harvard University.
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXII, 1911.

- Lucretiana: Notes on Books I and II of the *De Rerum Natura*. — *By J. S. Reid.*
An Attempt to Restore the γ Archetype of Terence Manuscripts. — *By Robert Henning Webb.*
Antecedents of Greek Corpuscular Theories. — *By William Arthur Heidel.*
The ὑποζώματα of Greek Ships. — *By Edward G. Schaubert.*
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1910-11:
 Quibus virtutum vitiorumque moralium exemplis ex suorum annalibus sumptis scriptores Latini antiqui usi sint. — *By Henry Wheatland Litchfield.*
 Quibus temporibus religiones ab Oriente ortae et Romae et in provinciis Romanis floruerint desierintque quaestiones. — *By Dwight Nelson Robinson.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIII, 1912.

- Some Features of the Allegorical Debate in Greek Literature. — *By Margaret Coleman Waites.*
A Manuscript of Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus* belonging to the General Theological Seminary in New York. — *By William Henry Paine Hatch.*
The Dramatic Art of Sophocles. — *By Chandler Rathfon Post.*
The Attic Alphabet in Thucydides: A Note on Thucydides, 8, 9, 2. — *By Henry Wheatland Litchfield.*
Further Notes on Sicilian Translations of the Twelfth Century. — *By Charles Homer Haskins.*
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1911-12:
 De Libris Aliquot Suetonianis. — *By Francis Howard Fobes.*
 De Ovidi Carminum Amatoriorum textus historia quaeritur. — *By Walter Houghton Freeman.*
 De Vaticiniis apud Poetas Graecos. — *By Roy Merle Peterson.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIV, 1913.

- Lucilius: The *Ars Poetica* of Horace, and Persius. — *By George Converse Fiske.*
The Latin Epyllion. — *By Carl Newell Jackson.*
De Rinucio Aretino Graecarum Litterarum Interprete. — *Scriptisit Dean P. Lockwood.*
The Dramatic Art of Menander. — *By Chandler Rathfon Post.*
Cicero's Judgment on Lucretius. — *By Henry Wheatland Litchfield.*
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1912-13:
 Quomodo Pictores Vasorum Graecorum Facta Herculis illustraverint quaeritur. —
 By Stephen Bleecker Luce, Jr.
 De Motibus Animi apud Poetas Epicos Homerum Apolloniumque expressis. — *By*
 Carroll H. May.
 Quid de somniis censuerint quoque modo eis usi sint antiqui quaeritur. — *By*
 Samuel Hart Newhall.
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXV, 1914.

- National Exempla Virtutis in Roman Literature. — *By Henry Wheatland Litchfield.*
Medical Allusions in the Works of St. Jerome. — *By Arthur Stanley Pease.*
Mediaeval Versions of the Posterior Analytics. — *By Charles Homer Haskins.*
The Law of the Hendecasyllable. — *By Roy Kenneth Hack.*
Molle atque Facetum. — *By Carl Newell Jackson.*
Hippocratea, I. — *By William Arthur Heidel.*
Summary of Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., 1913-14:
 De Praepositionis *Sub* Usu. — *By Henry T. Schnitkind.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXVI, 1915.

- Quo Modo Aristophanes Rem Temporalem in Fabulis Suis Tractaverit. — *Quaesivit*
Otis Johnson Todd.
The Roman Magistri in the Civil and Military Service of the Empire. — *By Arthur*
Edward Romilly Boak.
Notes on the Fourth and Fifth Centuries. — *By George W. Robinson.*
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1914-15:
 De Choro Euripideo. — *By Aristides Evangelus Phoutrides.*
 De Scripturae Hibernicae Fontibus. — *By William Frank Wyatt.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXVII, 1916.

- The Doctrine of Literary Forms. — *By Roy Kenneth Hack.*
The Historical Socrates in the Light of Professor Burnet's Hypothesis. — *By Charles*
Pomeroy Parker.
The Chorus of Euripides. — *By Aristides Evangelus Phoutrides.*
Summary of Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., 1915-16:
 Quo Modo Claudius Claudianus praeceptis rhetoricis in Laudationibus scribendis
 usus sit quaeritur. — *By Lester Burton Struthers.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXVIII, 1917.

- On the Second Book of Aristotle's Poetics and the Source of Theophrastus' Definition of Tragedy. — *By A. Philip McMahon.*
Chaucer's Lollus. — *By George Lyman Kittredge.*
A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy. — *By Evelyn Spring.*
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1916-17:
 De Vicis Atticis. — *By Robert Vincent Cram.*
 Quid de Poetis Plato censuerit. — *By William Chase Greene.*
 Quo Modo Graeci res naturales tractaverint. — *By Charles Ross Owens.*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIX, 1918.

Plato's View of Poetry. — *By William Chase Greene.*

Collations of the Manuscripts of Aristophanes' Aves. — *By John Williams White and Earnest Cary.*

Joseph Scaliger's Estimates of Greek and Latin Authors. — *By George W. Robinson*
Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXX, 1919.

Collations of the Manuscripts of Aristophanes' Vespa. — *By John Williams White and Earnest Cary.*

Imperial Coronation Ceremonies of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries. — *By A. E. R. Boak.*

The Rhetorical Structure of the Encomia of Claudius Claudian. — *By Lester B. Struthers.*

The Decree-seller in the *Birds*, and the Professional Politicians at Athens. — *By Carl Newell Jackson.*

Young Virgil's Poetry. — *By Edward Kennard Rand.*

Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXI, 1920.

The Religious Background of the *Prometheus Vinculus*. — *By James Alexander Kerr Thomson.*

*Τότερον πρότερον Ὀμηρικῶς. — *By Samuel E. Bassett.*

The Spirit of Comedy in Plato. — *By William Chase Greene.*

Ithaca: A Study of the Homeric Evidence. — *By Frank Brewster.*

Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXII, 1921

The Commentary on Aeschylus' Prometheus in the Codex Neapolitanus. — *By Herbert Weir Smyth.*

Prophecy in the Ancient Epic. — *By Clifford Herschel Moore.*

Studies in the Minoan Hieroglyphic Inscriptions. I. The Phaestos Whorl. — *By Champlin Burrage.*

Indexes.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXIII, 1922

The Dramatic Art of Sophocles as Revealed by the Fragments of the Lost Plays. — *By Chandler Rathfon Post.*

Asteris. — *By Frank Brewster.*

Browning's Ancient Classical Sources. — *By Thurman Los Hood.*

Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1920-21:

Quaestiones de libello quem Iulius Firmicus Maternus scripsit de errore profanarum religionum. — *By Lester Marsh Prindle.*

De Sortitione apud Athenienses. — *By Stanley Barney Smith.*

Index.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXIV, 1923

The Peloponnesos in the Bronze Age. — *By J. Penrose Harland.*

The *πρωτόματα* of Ancient Ships. — *By Frank Brewster.*

A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's *Letters*. — *By Edward Kennard Rand.*

Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1922-23:

De Scriptura Floriacensi. — *By Frederick Mason Carey.*

Quibus Rationibus Auctorum Latinorum Opera in Libris Manuscriptis Collecta Sint. — *By Eva Matthews Sanford.*

Indexes.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY



3 1867 00072 4356

Date Due

24731

480
H26
(v. 35.)

